

BL

THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

Edited by J. Alan Kay, M.A., Ph.D.

JULY 1957

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

Contributors Include

JUL

/

WAYS OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

JOAN FORD, M.A.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE, M.A., B.D.

T. S. GREGORY

STEPHAN HOPKINSON, M.A.

RONALD V. SPIVEY, M.A., D.D.

A. MARCUS WARD, M.A., D.D.

R. H. VAN APELDOORN, PH.D.

R. NEWTON FLEW, M.A., D.D.

JOHN FOSTER, M.A., D.D.

J. CLIFFORD HINDLEY, M.A.

H. P. RICKMAN, M.A., D. PHIL.

FREDERIC VANSON

PHILIP S. WATSON, M.A., B.D.



THE EPWORTH PRESS

[FRANK H. CUMBERS]

25-35 CITY ROAD LONDON EC1

Four Shillings Net

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW
is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

Editorial Comments by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	161	The Philosophy of Enthusiasm (II) by J. Clifford Hindley, M.A.	199
The Beginnings of Christian Worship by A. Raymond George, M.A., B.D.	168	Priesthood and Ministry (I) by Philip S. Watson, M.A., B.D.	211
How Eastern Orthodox Christians Worship by Joan Ford, M.A.	173	Healing in the Early Church (I) by John Foster, M.A., D.D.	217
The Mass by T. S. Gregory	178	Hope No More Vain by Frederic Vanson	223
The Worship of the Church of Eng- land by Stephan Hopkinson, M.A.	184	The Unreason in Modern Philosophy by H. P. Rickman, M.A., D.PHIL.	224
Methodism and the Means of Grace by Ronald V. Spivey, M.A., D.D.	188	Recent Literature Edited by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.	228
The Liturgy of the Church of South India by Marcus Ward, M.A., D.D.	192	From My New Shelf by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.	237
The Christian Background of the Netherlands by R. H. van Apeldoorn, PH.D.	196	Our Contributors	<i>Inside Back Cover</i>

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

(Founded by Dr Stephenson, 1869)

- ★ Need alone determines the admission of a child. Each application is decided on its merits, irrespective of class or creed.
- ★ There are 40 Branches of the Home in various parts of the country.
- ★ The children live in small families. No uniforms are worn.
- ★ The children are given a good education and vocational guidance. An After-Care Department gives advice and assistance when they leave the Home.
- ★ Nearly 39,000 boys and girls have already been helped. The number now being cared for is over 3,000.
- ★ The Home still depends on voluntary support. Funds are urgently needed to meet the greatly increased cost of maintaining the work.

Chief Offices: HIGHBURY PARK, LONDON, N.5



CHI

T

dence
the e
Sun
nom
and
Serv
brea
given
wors
sion
Wha
W

Hum
natu
to an
acce
servi
thele
the h
of do
appl
wors

Fi
to br
and
servi
never
This
of th
the r

TI
are n
whic
right
attitu
it is
cent
cent
distr
relati

Editorial Comments

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

THIS quarter we print a little symposium of articles by contributors who describe various ways of Christian worship, usually that of their own denomination; and the very fact that such different ways exist inevitably raises the question: What form ought worship to take? We may believe that the ideal Sunday worship of the Christian Church is a Communion Service, but in denominations where services are conducted by laymen that is not always possible and some substitute has to be found. Moreover, even when a Communion Service is held, we have to ask, What is the right form for it? The eating of the bread and drinking of the wine, together with the interpretation which scripture gives, is an expression in action of all that is needed for a complete service of worship; but it is both usual and desirable to precede that action by an expression in words of the things which it signifies, and that means that we must ask, What is the best manner in which this should be done?

We do not for one moment suggest that there is only one right form of service. Human minds and temperaments are of infinite variety, and therefore what is natural to one is unnatural to another and what is helpful to one is a hindrance to another. In particular, the amount of ceremonial which men find useful and acceptable varies enormously, and it will always be right that there should be services conducted in different manners to suit different sorts of people. Nevertheless, the fundamental principles of worship are identical for everyone, and the basic things to be done in a service are always the same, whatever the manner of doing them. We will therefore try to enumerate the general principles which apply to all forms of service that have any claim to provide a complete act of worship.

First, the service must be centred in God. Everything possible must be done to bring about and to maintain a personal relationship between the worshippers and the living God in whose presence they are. Right from the beginning of the service the congregation should find themselves looking at God, and they should never see their own needs, desires, or sins, except in the light of His presence. This means that their thoughts should constantly be fixed upon Him, and one of the important effects of prayers of adoration, hymns of praise, creeds, and the relative clauses of collects is that they turn one's eyes to God.

The God who is thus worshipped is a Trinity, and although the three Persons are mutually inclusive, there is likely to be something incomplete about worship which is not consciously concerned with all three. Dr R. H. Thouless has very rightly pointed out (in *Authority and Freedom*) that 'distortions of devotional attitude may result from overemphasis on one person of the Trinity', and that it is easily possible for religion to be 'exaggeratedly Father-centred, Jesus-centred, or Spirit-centred'. The eighteenth century was notable for a Father-centred religion, and as a result its worship tended to be legalistic and formal, distrustful of tenderness and enthusiasm, and with little sense of personal relationship. An exclusively Jesus-centred religion has been found, among

other places, in the teaching of certain types of missionaries, who have stressed the homeliness of God to the exclusion of His mystery and majesty; the result has been sentimentality, cosiness, over-familiarity, and a religion which is inadequate to deal with the vastness, mystery, and power of the forces in the midst of which we live. The appeal of an exaggeratedly Spirit-centred religion is to inner experience; it neglects history, tradition and the community life of the Church, and it easily leads to self-centredness and even fanaticism.

Of course all these are perversions. We misunderstand the Father when we think of Him as remote; we misapprehend Jesus when we ignore His majesty; and we misconceive the Spirit when we think of an experience that is purely individual. Nevertheless, they are perversions into which it is easy to fall, and we are only certainly delivered from them if we remember that God manifests Himself to us as three Persons, and worship Him accordingly.

Secondly, the service must be so designed that through it God's voice may be heard and His gifts received. The most important thing that happens in worship is that God acts. In a moment we shall be emphasizing the fact that worship is a sacrifice, but it is not only a sacrifice, and those who criticize worshippers for going to church in order to receive something are mistaken. Of course we must go to receive, for worship is a receiving as well as a giving; indeed what is received is infinitely greater than what is given, for it is received from God. It is partly the receiving of God's word, both in command and in comfort; but it is supremely the receiving of God Himself, for through our worship He comes to enter and to dwell within us. This is particularly clear in the service of Holy Communion, where our receiving of bread and wine into ourselves is a means by which we receive the Living Lord; but it is an essential element of all forms of worship.

It is not possible to limit the parts of the service through which God comes to us; any part of it may be the means of His entrance, and indeed to some extent every part is a channel through which He comes. One would expect Him to come most freely and most fully, however, through those parts of it which are directly addressed to the congregation, those parts in which they consciously wait to receive—the reading of the scriptures and the preaching of the word. These elements in worship have thus a unique importance, and it is right that they should receive great emphasis.

There is, however, another place which should be looked upon, from this point of view, as being of quite outstanding importance, and that is the Blessing. We should look upon this, not as a pious wish, not even as a prayer, but as an invocation meaning, 'Let the blessing of God now descend'. In this moment there is offered all the grace of the Lord Jesus, all the love of God, and all the fellowship of the Spirit; in this moment the worshippers may accept all the riches of God and make them their own.

Thirdly, the service must be a suitable medium through which we can offer our sacrifice. The sacrifice itself has many aspects, but ultimately it is nothing less than the gift of ourselves, and of our whole selves as complete persons.

There is always something artificial about dividing human personality into parts, but it is convenient to remember that it has various aspects, and that to give oneself means giving our mind, feeling, will and deed. A sacrifice from which one of these is omitted is incomplete. It is not adequate if it leaves out

the in-
total
God.
high-
worsh
selves
firm

As
Angli
is tha
it on
servi
dedic
out to

For
are to
corpo
at the
than
worsh
never
worsh
grega
and e
receiv
self-o

It i
aspect
expre
needs
come
is not

No
praye
own p
do it,
wroug
shoul
satisfi
that i
sonal
Him.

If a
partic
cal pr
occasi
and p
conter

the intelligence, however warm and full of zest the emotions may be. It is not a total gift if it has no content of feeling, however determined be the will to please God. It is not perfect if it does not include the will to do and to serve, however high be the thought and however great be the love. It is not full Christian worship if it does not include a co-operating with God in prayer, both for ourselves and for others, however noble the meditation, purifying the emotion, and firm the will to do good.

As we once pointed out in a past editorial, one of the shortcomings of the Anglican order of Morning Prayer, if it is used as a full Sunday morning service, is that it contains no act of dedication. It is, however, not really fair to criticize it on that ground, because it was never intended to be a full Sunday morning service. The full Sunday service was Holy Communion, and that does contain dedication; Morning Prayer was provided as a daily service, and does not set out to be complete.

Fourthly, the service must be adapted to the individual needs of those who are to take part in it. We shall later be stressing its corporateness, but it is not corporate in any sense which contradicts the fact that it is individual; it is both at the same time. It is true that a Christian congregation is a great deal more than merely the sum of the members which compose it, and that corporate worship is a great deal more than the joint offering of a number of individuals; nevertheless, there is no congregation apart from the members, and there is no worship at all if no individual offerings are made. Each member of the congregation has individual needs, sins, causes for rejoicing and responsibilities, and each has an individual sacrifice to offer. He must be able in the service to receive the special gifts which God has prepared for himself and to make that self-offering which no one but he can give.

It is not possible to pray in detail about everything in one service, but all the aspects of worship which a normal Christian from time to time finds need to express should be found there. It ought not to be possible for a worshipper who needs to express his penitence, his joy, or his concern for someone in need, to come out of the service unsatisfied; though regrettably that is an experience that is not unknown.

Not only should all these aspects of worship be present, but the hymns and prayers should be so phrased and ordered that each individual can pour his own particular needs and causes for rejoicing into them. He should be able to do it, too, with his own degree of intensity; these things should not be so highly wrought that only those who are overwhelmed by feeling can use them, nor should they be so matter of fact that those whose feelings are intense are not satisfied by the expression of them. Similarly, the sermon should be so delivered that it comforts and challenges and strengthens each individual in his own personal life; God should be so offered that each individual person may receive Him.

If a service is wholly to satisfy the needs of a particular congregation on a particular occasion, we believe that some part of it must be extempore. Liturgical prayers which are intended for all sorts of congregations on all sorts of occasions have their own very considerable value; but they cannot particularize, and particularization is often necessary; they cannot deal pointedly with the contemporary situation, and it often needs to be dealt with pointedly; they

cannot always say exactly what ought to be said at a certain time and place, and exactness is very often what a congregation needs.

Fifthly, the service must provide for a worship which is fully corporate. The members of a congregation are individuals, but they are not separate; they come before God as members of a family, and that family is the whole Church on earth and in Heaven. The service must be so arranged as to help them to feel this. They must be given a consciousness of their unity with one another, a sense of belonging to the whole Church of God throughout all the world, and a knowledge that in worship the Church on earth is one with angels and archangels and all the company of Heaven.

This is partly accomplished by helping them to think about it. One of the not unimportant reasons for praying for the universal Church, for giving thanks for the servants of God who have 'departed this life', and for singing such hymns as 'Ye holy angels bright', is that these things remind the congregation that they are part of an immense and glorious company. The same effect is produced by using the great hymns and prayers of the Church which have been uttered by the lips of her saints all over the earth and all down the centuries.

It is also accomplished, at any rate so far as the unity of the local congregation is concerned, by encouraging them to do things visibly and audibly together. It is a matter for grave concern that in so many Free Church services the congregation take no more audible part in worship than to sing the hymns and say the Lord's Prayer. They should certainly associate themselves with the prayers by saying 'Amen' at the end of them (after all, there is very little point in the minister saying it), and ways should be found of providing opportunities for them to make responses. We talk a great deal about the priesthood of all believers, but this elementary example of it is often strangely and regrettably neglected.

It is of course true that if the congregation are going to utter prayers together, set forms of words are necessary, and there are those who are very suspicious of set forms. But where a congregation is merely going to make a response, the wording of the prayers to which they respond may very well be extempore, so long as the substance of them has been thought out beforehand. In any case, however, no Sunday service of any denomination (except the Society of Friends) is entirely extempore, for the hymns that are used are just as much set forms as liturgical prayers are, and it is difficult to see why we should accept the one and reject the other.

Sixthly, since the Christian life (and included in that life is Christian worship) is lived by faith, the tone of the worship should be such as to encourage and express the faith of the worshippers. Very much more could be done about this in our services than is done at present. There are two places in particular where help could be more effectively given. One of them is in connexion with the prayer of penitence. This ought to be followed by a statement that those who repent and believe are in very truth forgiven; there are many who do not receive the forgiveness of God because they cannot feel assured that it has been given, but if they were told 'It is given to you *now*', they would be able to accept it. Faith is helped by fixing a moment in which something shall be done. The woman in the Gospels who had haemorrhage fixed such a point in time. She said to herself, 'In the moment when I touch the hem of His garment it will

happen'
healing
but it w
miracle
receiving
much in
the Wes

The s
interces
reading
such pr
into the
Lord's
and sug
satisfact
assuran
grant th
of confi
these p
might v
custom
and for
There
God's

Last
Just as
sermon
devout
difficul
is neve
incoher
is an a
comple
could,
service
has do
happen

Coh
about
or for
Never
matter
are tw
as Mo
the Ps

happen', and her expectation was realized. The touch was not necessary for healing (there were others whom Jesus healed without any physical contact at all) but it was a help to her faith; because she was able to fix a moment when the miracle should be done, she found it easier to believe. So it is also with the receiving of forgiveness. It may be added that this fixing of a moment is very much in the Methodist tradition—think how often the word 'now' appears in the Wesley hymns, and how often one finds such words as—

*This moment may I now receive
The answer to His powerful prayer.*

The second place where help could be given is after prayers of petition and intercession. Faith is strengthened by being expressed (think of the effect of reading Psalm 23 or Romans 8), and it would be a very good thing to follow such prayers with an expression of our faith that, now we have put our requests into the hands of God, we may safely leave Him to deal with them. Just as the Lord's Prayer ends with an assurance that God rules in omnipotence and glory, and suggests to us that He is both able and willing to bring things to an entirely satisfactory end, and just as the Anglican order of Morning Prayer ends with the assurance that 'when two or three are gathered together in Thy Name Thou wilt grant their requests', so it would be well if our prayers ended with an expression of confidence in the glorious will and power of God. If, as we shall suggest later, these prayers should end with the Lord's Prayer, this expression of confidence might well be a kind of expansion of the *Gloria* with which it ends. It is customary in some liturgies for the Lord's Prayer to end before this *Gloria*, and for the words about being delivered from evil to be expanded at some length. There is nothing therefore unseemly in expanding instead the passage about God's Kingdom, Power, and Glory by adding a prayer of confidence.

Lastly, and at rather greater length, the service must be a coherent whole. Just as a number of disconnected remarks, however excellent, do not make a sermon, so a number of disconnected items do not make a service, however devout each one of them may be in itself. A service which does not cohere is very difficult for the worshipper to follow and enter into; to keep the attention fixed is never easy (much less easy for the congregation than for the preacher), and incoherence adds enormously to the difficulty. Moreover, the unity of a service is an aid to faith; it gives an impression of something begun, continued and completed, a piece of work accomplished; the worshipper has done what he could, and now the issue of the whole is in the hands of God. An incoherent service is apt to make the worshipper feel that he does not quite know what he has done, and that perhaps there was something more that God intended to happen if the service was really to accomplish what He desired.

Coherence does not of course mean that everything in the service must be about the same subject, though that may be all right for some special occasion or for some service which does not set out to be a complete form of worship. Nevertheless, certain parts of the service ought to be connected by subject matter. The two lessons, for example, should be thus linked together. There are two ways of arranging a lectionary. One is that used for a daily service such as Morning Prayer, where the aim is to read through the Bible and sing through the Psalter. It is obviously impossible in that case that the two lessons should

always be connected; the only satisfactory method is to read through both the Old Testament and the New in order, and the link is between the lessons of one day and that of the next. The other way is that used for the weekly service such as the Eucharist in the Book of Common Prayer. There the Gospel and Epistle for each week are carefully related. In the first part of the ecclesiastical year, from Advent to Trinity, the Gospels commemorate the various events of the life of Christ on earth and the Epistles deal with the doctrines connected with them; in the second part of the year, from Trinity to Advent, it is the Epistles which form a continuous series of teaching and the Gospels are chosen with reference to them. It is this second method which is the best one for the weekly worship we are considering.

The sermon should also be linked to the subject matter of the lessons. After all, the sermon originated as an exposition of the lessons which had been read, and that is the character it should still have. If there is a children's address, that also should be connected with one of the lessons, though it may very well take up some suitable point that is not going to be developed in the sermon. Similarly, the hymn which follows the lesson ought to have some connexion with it, and that which follows the sermon ought in some way to apply it.

It is even more important, perhaps, that each aspect of devotion should lead on naturally to the next. It is instructive to notice how this is done in some parts of Morning Prayer. After an introduction consisting of exhortation, penitence, absolution and the Lord's Prayer, there is a prayer that God will open our lips and a call to praise Him. Then follows the introductory psalm which says 'O come let us sing unto the Lord' and 'show ourselves glad in him with psalms', which naturally introduces the psalms that follow. After the Old Testament lesson comes the *Te Deum*, which begins with creation and continues with redemption, thus forming a link between the Old Covenant and the New, and leading on to the New Testament lesson which follows. After this second lesson comes the Benedictus, in which we praise God for the mighty salvation which the New Testament reading has just proclaimed. The service of evening prayer has a similar structure.

There are other aspects of devotion which naturally follow on one from another; but, in Free Church services especially, this natural order is very often disturbed. Three things in particular may be mentioned. The first is the position of the Lord's Prayer. The Lord's Prayer is really a summary; it says everything one desires to say in prayer. Now the place for a summary is either at the beginning of one's praying or at the end of it; but by inserting it after the first prayer we put it in the middle, and there it is certainly out of place. The second misplaced element is the prayer of dedication. It is fitting that it should be associated with the offering, so that the giving of money should become the symbol of the giving of ourselves; but the place where this is most natural is after the will of God has been declared, that is to say, after the sermon and not before it. (It is hardly convenient that there should be a pause and an organ voluntary at this point, and therefore it is better that the offerings should be received during the singing of a hymn. No doubt the passing of a plate is a slight distraction, but if there is a sufficient number of stewards to complete this piece of worship quickly, it is not serious, and in any case it is preferable to the 'half-time' atmosphere that so often develops during the more ordinary way of

doing
after t
but in
not b

The
follow
take
Adora
and fo
word
out o

opera
receiv
servic

Th
ways,
help i
the fo
adora
forgiv
conne
God's
neede
the c
(both
by an
God's

Th
be a
woul
Angli
hymn
stress
been
work
the c
them
not a
hand
much
praye
the p
of the

It i
ately
have
woul
exten

doing it.) The third misplaced element is the 'second prayer'. If this comes after the second lesson, it interrupts the connexion between lessons and sermon, but in any case the time when one most wants to pray is after the sermon and not before it.

The natural order of a full service of worship would therefore seem to be as follows. After a prayer for God's help in the worship in which we are going to take part, the right beginning is adoration, which fixes the mind on God. Adoration leads inevitably to penitence, penitence to the receiving of forgiveness, and forgiveness to praise. This is followed by a desire to hear and receive God's word (lessons and their exposition in a sermon). The hearing of His word draws out our dedication; dedication is followed by thanksgiving and by actual co-operation with Him in prayer and intercession. And finally, in the Blessing, we receive His sufficient grace for the life into which we go when we leave the service.

These various elements of worship can no doubt be expressed in various ways, but the following would be a good way of doing it. A prayer for God's help in worship (this is most conveniently done either as a private prayer or in the form of an introit sung by the choir); a hymn of adoration; a prayer of adoration followed by penitence and absolution; a hymn of thanksgiving for the forgiveness which has just been received; the Old Testament lesson; a hymn connected with it; the New Testament lesson; a hymn asking for grace to hear God's voice in the sermon ('Master, speak, thy servant heareth' is the kind needed at this point); the sermon; a hymn applying the sermon, during which the offerings are received; a prayer of dedication, thanksgiving, request (both for ourselves and others), all summed up in the Lord's prayer and followed by an expression of confidence that we are now content to leave all things in God's hands; a hymn of confidence or praise; the Blessing.

This would mean having six periods of music, one of which, if desired, might be a suitable canticle, psalm or anthem. If this were thought too much, it would no doubt be possible to omit the one between the two lessons; but the Anglican service of Morning Prayer (as it is generally used today) contains eight hymns and chants, so six ought not to be too many for Free Church people who stress the importance of singing. It will be noticed that no announcements have been mentioned. Logically they are concerned with an important part of the work which the members of the congregation are going to do for God during the coming week, and therefore, in theory, it ought not to be difficult to make them a real and relevant part of the Sunday worship. In practice, however, it is not at all easy to do this. Perhaps the ideal is to have them duplicated and handed to the congregation as they leave the service; but failing that, there is much to be said for inserting them after the prayer of dedication and before the prayer of thanksgiving and request. That position is quite logical, and it gives the preacher an opportunity for praying, in the prayer which follows, about some of the activities which have been mentioned.

It is obvious that a form of service such as this could be treated either elaborately or simply; various parts of it could be expanded if desired, and it could have just as much or as little ceremonial as was found to be helpful. There would be room in it for some of the ancient prayers of the Church and for extempore prayers which dealt with the particular needs of the congregation

and the contemporary situation in the world. It could use responses which might be announced at the time or placed in printed form in the hands of the congregation. It would have room for variety and yet provide a definite and clear structure which would be easy for the congregation to follow. It could be followed by Holy Communion, incorporating the 'synagogue' part of that service into its structure and continuing after the Blessing with *Sursum Corda* and the ancient dialogue with which our Lord must have begun the meal in the upper room. Moreover, it is not very different from the order of the ordinary Free Church service, and the only changes the congregation would have to get used to would be the alteration in the position of the Lord's Prayer and in that of the 'Second Prayer'. If it were possible to adopt it, it would, we believe, make our services into a coherent whole, and enrich both our sacrifice and our acceptance of God's gifts.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

THE beginnings of Christian worship lie in the gatherings of the disciples of Christ. It was His custom to attend the synagogue on the Sabbath, and presumably they went with Him. He also visited the Temple at Jerusalem; He expressed indignation at what He found there, but He also referred to it as 'a house of prayer'. His piety was rooted in the religious customs of Judaism. Yet these were not the direct origin of distinctively Christian worship. The disciples did indeed continue for a while after the coming of the Holy Spirit to attend the synagogue in the various towns which they visited and to use its services as an opportunity for preaching, so long as they were allowed to do so. When they were in Jerusalem they continued for a while to visit the Temple. But they also held meetings of their own which were a direct continuation of those which they had had with Jesus Himself. Even between the ascension and the coming of the Holy Spirit they assembled to conduct necessary business; and such gatherings speedily developed into meetings for worship. And that worship was distinctively Christian; that is, it was the worship of God revealed in Jesus Christ. The first account of Christian worship which we have from a non-Christian writer occurs in a letter written by a Roman official, Pliny the younger, in about A.D. 112; he says that the Christians meet and recite a hymn to Christ as to a god. Naturally they did not do this during His lifetime; but the

two miracles of the Resurrection and the sending of the Holy Spirit led them to direct their adoration to Christ long before they had worked out the implications of this in the complexities of Trinitarian theology. We have no complete account of such a gathering in New Testament times, but we have a good deal of evidence. Let us try to imagine such a gathering thirty years or so after the death of Christ.

The Christians gather daily, but their main service is on the first day of the week, the Lord's Day. They do not call this the Sabbath, nor do they associate it with rest; they have chosen it because on the first day of the week Christ rose from the dead. Every Sunday is a kind of Easter Day. They meet very early in the morning, for it is not a public holiday, and they have their daily work to do; indeed some of them are slaves. There are of course by now a number of such gatherings; in Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, wherever converts have been won, such a meeting is held. It is held in a private house, and, as far as possible, all who live in the same place meet in the same house; there are no separate meetings of those who are of a particular race or hold a particular point of view.

A group of men sit behind a table in a semi-circle facing the others, because they preside over the meeting; they are called 'elders' or sometimes 'overseers' (*episcopoi*). Presumably one of them acts as a kind of chairman or president. The meeting is not what we should call an evangelistic service; they will go out into the streets or into the synagogues, except when persecution makes it quite impossible, to preach the mighty acts of God in Christ and to offer salvation. Nevertheless there may be some casual visitors there, at least for the first part of the meeting, and the proceedings must be intelligible to them.

The first part of the meeting is not altogether unlike the service at the synagogue; at any rate it relies on the spoken word. A passage is read from their scripture, namely the Old Testament. There is as yet no New Testament as such, but a few months ago they received a letter from Paul, or perhaps made a copy of one sent to a neighbouring church. It helps so much towards building them up in the faith that they read a portion of it almost as though it ranked with the Old Testament scriptures. There are no written 'Gospels', but they are fortunate to have someone there who personally remembers some of the events of Christ's life, and he delivers his reminiscences for a while. Someone, reflecting that he will not live for ever, is quietly making a few notes for use when he is gone. Then the person presiding, or perhaps some visiting prophet who has been invited to sit with the local elders, speaks to the gathering; he shows how the events in the story of Christ fulfil the prophecy which has been read from the Old Testament and urges them to practise the truths contained in the letter from Paul. Interspersed into this part of the meeting are psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, some of them new Christian hymns, such as those ascribed to the heavenly choirs in the Revelation of St John.

The people then stand, and the president leads them in intercessory prayers, perhaps with intervals of silence; and they show their fellowship by kissing each other.

If it were not the first day of the week, the meeting would end at this point; but today we go on. Gifts are brought in money or kind, each giving what he can afford, for the payment of necessary expenses and the support of the poor

and the sick. They will be distributed afterwards, and perhaps some of the money will be sent to the support of the poor Christians in Jerusalem.

As the proceedings move to their climax, which is a common meal, they utter the prayer Maranatha, 'May the Lord come', by which they ask that Christ may now come and be in the midst as they keep His commandment to do this in memory of Him; and by so coming He will in some sense anticipate His final coming in glory and judgement and their joining with Him in the heavenly banquet. Then comes the meal; in some places this is a full meal, a lovefeast, which at some point or points in its course includes those actions which are here to be described. But in this city the lovefeast is now held separately, and we do not have it today. The president imitates the actions which Christ performed in the upper room in the night in which He was betrayed. Jesus Christ took bread and wine; so he takes bread and wine which are handed to him. Christ then gave thanks; so he gives thanks, a kind of extended 'Grace before meat'; and in his prayer of thanksgiving (*eucharistia*) he praises God for creating the world and for sending His Son Jesus Christ; here he perhaps inserts into his prayer the narrative of what happened in the upper room, which is written in one of Paul's letters and which everyone knows by heart anyhow; he then goes on to give thanks for the death and Resurrection and Ascension of Christ. There follow some words of self-oblation, a prayer for the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and intercessions; and the people give their assent to the whole prayer uttered on their behalf by saying very heartily, 'Amen'. The president neither reads the prayer nor knows it by heart; but the themes are always the same, and indeed the phrases are becoming familiar; the observant note-taker, who sometimes notes down such things also, notices that it is much the same as last week. If, however, a visiting prophet is invited to make the thanksgiving, the basic pattern will be much the same, but the details may differ a good deal.

The next thing that Jesus did was to break the bread; so the president breaks it. There is no religious significance in this, except that it imitates Christ's own action; the action is necessary, as it was in the upper room, simply that the bread may be available for distribution.

Lastly, Christ gave it; and so now it is given, possibly by assistants, to the assembled Christians, who devoutly receive it, knowing that the bread which they break is a partaking of the Body of Christ. The wine is also given.

The observant will notice that these four actions do not correspond precisely with what Christ did. Christ did these four things with the bread, and only then performed three of them (all except the breaking) with the wine; that is, he took, gave thanks, and gave a second time, making seven actions in all. But, possibly when the lovefeast came to be held separately, these seven actions were telescoped into a fourfold shape.

At some point in the meeting, possibly at the end, when the people have received afresh the power of the Holy Spirit, there is an opportunity for those present to prophesy or to speak with tongues. The president, remembering Paul's expressed wish that all things should be done 'decently and in order', tries to keep this part of the proceedings within reasonable bounds and to see that, when someone speaks with tongues, someone else interprets. He does not want the people to be merely bewildered but to be built up.

The meeting ends with a brief word of dismissal.

Th
when
did H
at th
that y
suppe
a kind
festiv
atmos
fican
when
On ei
other
the id
which
comm
Bu
dying
thous
fourf
of wh
decor
expec
merg
at th
they
had a
the o
His f
of Hi
ing t
nation
Th
was a
no do
runn
able
Pass
Frida
reder
Chri
ceded
paga
Lord
asks
of hi
runn
mom

Thus the origin of the main part of their worship lies in the actions of Christ when He and the disciples were gathered in the upper room. What precisely did He do there? It is clear that this supper took place on a Thursday evening at the Passover season. What is not clear is whether the Passover meal was in that year on the Thursday or on the Friday evening. If the former, then the supper *was* the Passover, adapted by Jesus for His purposes. If the latter, then a kind of preliminary ceremony with bread and wine, which preceded religious festivals, would fall on the Thursday, and Jesus adapted this; even so, the atmosphere was that of the Passover season, and Jesus thus showed the significance of His death on the Friday, which, on this view, took place at the time when the Passover lambs were being slain for the meal on the Friday evening. On either view the supper and the death were intimately bound up with each other and with the Passover. Thus it is not surprising that Paul emphasized the idea that those who perpetuated this rite were proclaiming the Lord's death, which was a great act of deliverance and redemption. The Passover also had commemorated a great deliverance.

But the early Christians did not view this supper simply as a memorial of a dying Lord; they thought of earlier meals, such as the feeding of the five thousand, at which Christ's actions had, not indeed surprisingly, had the same fourfold shape; and they thought of the joyful Resurrection appearances, some of which also had been connected with meals. That is why later they often decorated the catacombs with pictures of bread and fish where we might have expected bread and wine. These various trends of thought about the supper merged gradually into one rich many-sided conception; and they realized that at the supper they were in fellowship with a crucified, risen, and living Lord; they commemorated that mighty act of deliverance and redemption which He had accomplished by offering Himself upon the cross as a perfect sacrifice; by the operation of the Holy Spirit they partook of Christ present with them, eating His flesh and drinking His blood; and they looked to the future consummation of His kingdom when they would partake of the heavenly banquet. By performing these acts in faith they built each other up as a royal priesthood, a holy nation, the Body of Christ, the people of God.

The Sunday service never differed very much from this, except when there was a baptism. This is not so easy to describe; we have less information, and no doubt the circumstances varied more, according to such factors as whether a running stream was near at hand. But we do know that it was a very considerable occasion, and we may conjecture that it often took place at the time of the Passover, or rather on the following Lord's Day, which was, as it were, Good Friday and Easter Day rolled into one, the great festival of the Christian redemption. (Apart from this and Pentecost, they had not developed the Christian year.) Doubtless after the very earliest times the baptism was preceded by some period of instruction. Then the candidate, a convert either from paganism or from Judaism, probably began the proceedings on the appointed Lord's Day by asking, 'What prevents me from being baptized?' The president asks him if he believes with all his heart, and he makes a very brief confession of his faith that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. He is then plunged into a running stream, if possible, and baptized in the name of Christ. As he is momentarily buried under the water, his old sinful self is crucified with Christ;

and as he rises from the water, he is raised together with Him to a new life, in which his first act is to attend and, for the first time, to partake of the Lord's Supper. Probably the members of his family and household are baptized also, and we cannot rule out the possibility that these may include very young children. Certainly there is no evidence that their baptism was ever delayed till they were adolescent. The Lord's Supper follows with little delay, and possibly the usual readings and sermon are omitted; the baptism itself has preached the good news of the risen Christ. Thus admitted into the people of God, they will maintain their membership by attending each Lord's Day the kind of meeting which has already been described. The weekly supper, itself full of the joy of the resurrection, will forever recall to them that first supper in which they joined with the people of God as well as that last supper which Jesus took with His disciples. That earlier supper they had never witnessed, but it was kept alive in the corporate memory of the Church by its continual observance.

How do we know all this? Most of it is in the New Testament, but we are so apt to read that from a particular point of view that we do not notice these things until they are brought to our attention by the fresh interest which New Testament scholars are now taking in worship. The chief uncertainty lies in the order of the individual items, and here we have drawn cautiously on the first full account of a Christian service, which is that written by Justin Martyr in the next century. And of course imagination has added a few touches; but let the sceptical reader consult such a work as Oscar Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, pp.1-36, and he will be surprised to find how many of the individual items can be inferred from the New Testament itself.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

IT is
unfa
worshi
Orthod
imagin
ment o
Sund
This is
of the
also to
of the
the Te
Euchar
the sac
may als
conduc
from t
Temple
this is
learn fr
As w
and fun
Orthod
ground
eastern
and con
the scr
dome c
are ma
looks d
are apo
heaven
iconost
Foreru
—the I
calenda
ticular
Wha
where
munio
he ente
part ag
the thr
he goes

HOW EASTERN ORTHODOX CHRISTIANS WORSHIP

IT is not easy in a short space to give an adequate account of something so unfamiliar and complex in its structure and symbolism as Eastern Orthodox worship. The best advice for anyone interested is to attend worship in an Orthodox church; and for the moment, perhaps the best approach for us is to imagine ourselves spending a Sunday with the Orthodox, and pause and comment on what we see and hear.

Sunday in the Orthodox Church begins on Saturday evening with Vespers. This is one of many reminders in Orthodox liturgical forms and customs of those of the earliest Christians, the Jewish Church. From the Jews the early Church also took the two strands which we now find interwoven in public worship: that of the synagogue—psalmody, scripture reading and exposition—and that of the Temple—sacrifice. For example, the first part of the Orthodox Liturgy, the Eucharistic synaxis, corresponds to the 'synagogue' strand, and the second part, the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, to the Temple worship. These two strands may also be the origins of the two manners in which we find Christian worship conducted—plain and ornate—the sober concentration on God's word coming from the synagogue, and the vestments, lights and incense, etc., from the Temple. There is place for both in rightly-ordered Christian worship, and this is one of the unifying lessons which we divided Christians of the west can learn from the Orthodox.

As we enter the church for Vespers, the first thing we notice is its architecture and furnishing, closely adapted to the worship offered there. By our standards, Orthodox churches are rather small, intricate and much-decorated. The typical ground-plan is a Greek cross, the eastern arm rounded into an apse. This eastern arm is separated from the rest of the church by the screen or iconostase, and contains the Holy Table. ('The altar' is the whole part of the church behind the screen.) Beyond the western arm of the cross is the porch or narthex, and a dome covers the centre of the church where the two arms cross. Often there are many smaller domes as well. Christ the Pantocrator in fresco or mosaic looks down from the dome on His assembled people, and ranged in order below are apostles, evangelists, patriarchs, prophets, saints, and the angelic powers of heaven. There may also be scenes from the Bible or the lives of saints. In the iconostase are more pictures, the icons of Christ, His Mother, St John the Forerunner, St Michael, St Gabriel, the patron saint of the church, and others—the Last Supper, the Annunciation, the twelve great feasts of the Orthodox calendar—their number depends partly on the size and resources of the particular church.

What is the purpose of all these pictures? certainly instruction, especially where illiteracy used to be widespread, but much more than that: the Communion of Saints is an ever-present reality to the Orthodox Christian, and when he enters a church, his eyes and all his senses remind him that he is now to take part again in the worship which all the redeemed are offering incessantly before the throne of God. The church for him is 'heaven on earth'. On entering he goes to certain of the icons and greets them with prayer and a reverence,

sometimes saluting our Lord or the saint or mystery represented by kissing the icon and lighting a candle.

There are several consequences of regarding presence in church as a foretaste of heaven—first, nobody is in a hurry to leave, and Orthodox services are not cut to beat the clock. It is only fair to add also that Orthodox Christians do not all arrive together punctually at the beginning of a service. Secondly, there is no sense of strain, of wondering whether the service will be successful, will uplift the people's hearts and minds to God. One cannot say that the Orthodox priest, in his liturgical function, 'takes' or conducts the service for the people; and little or nothing depends on his human personality or gifts. The form of service is set by venerable tradition, the variable parts follow the liturgical year in its complex pattern, and there are customary abbreviations of offices which can only be sung in full in the monasteries. The priest has his part, essential in the Liturgy and important in the offices, and so has the deacon (though in practice his part has sometimes to be taken by the priest); but by far the more varied part is that assigned to the laity, and usually delegated to singers and readers. Sermons do not form part of the offices, and in the Liturgy the sermon properly comes immediately after the Gospel.

Thirdly, as heaven is perfect freedom, nobody is compelled (by social pressure or other means) to follow the service in a particular way, by reading the words in a book, joining audibly in the singing or prayers, or kneeling and standing when others do. Some people do follow with books, and repeat the hymns and prayers in a low voice, but they do it spontaneously and unselfconsciously. The language used is, in principle, the vernacular of the country; in practice the Greek and Slavonic (e.g.) of the Liturgy are about as far from modern Greek, Russian and Serbian as Chaucer's English is from ours. There is a considerable difference, but it is lessened by familiarity.

Fourthly, as befits heaven, everything is as beautiful as it can be made, according to local taste and resources. Singing, lights, and incense are part of every service, and the clergy and usually the servers wear the traditional vestments in rich colours. There is no organ or other musical instrument. The unaccompanied singing is either traditional plain chant or in some town churches the so-called 'European' settings, based on traditional melodies, but using modern notation and ordinary four-part harmony.

Apart from the bishop's throne there are very few seats, for the Orthodox customarily stand to pray, as the first Christians did. Some seats near the walls are provided for the old and weak. A further reason for not filling the body of the church with seats is the number and importance of the liturgical processions, and of the functions which take place in the centre of the church, under the dome: weddings, services of prayer for the living and departed, the blessing of waters at the Epiphany, the adoration of the holy Cross on 14th September, and the moving and dramatic ceremonies of Holy Week, to name only a selection. Other normal elements in the church furnishing are the pulpit, on the north side, and the epitaphion, representing the tomb of Christ, which is kept to one side except during Good Friday, when it stands covered in flowers in the centre of the church and receives the icon of the lifeless body of the Saviour. Here it may be remarked that the annual cycle of feast and fast—the Church's liturgical year—has an extraordinary hold on the imagination and

devotion
marks
and dr

W
It has
height,
and th
When
the Ho
countr
curtain
is less
some v
screen
said, a
can als
worshi
screen
and ha
again t
and w

By m
and fo
sanctu
God's
which
but in
the ne
mercy
usuall
a com
Mean
litany,
There
eleven

Ves
from t
of the
and o
closes
Trisa

Th
appro
nation
sung
of the
mutat
the M

devotion of Orthodox Christians, and that the ceremonies by which their Church marks the great moments of that year are unsurpassed in effective symbolism and dramatic vigour.

We look now at the iconostase and consider the effect it has on worship. It has three doors; the centre one is double and comes only to waist or shoulder height, the space above being curtained. It is only used for ceremonial purposes, and the two doors on either side are the normal way in and out of the altar. When the Royal Doors (the central ones) are closed and the curtain drawn across, the Holy Table cannot be seen. Present practice varies in different Orthodox countries, but the tendency now in the Greek Church is to keep the doors and curtain open for most of the Liturgy. It has been remarked that the iconostase is less effective as a barrier between priest and people than the great length of some western choirs and chancels, since the faithful can come right up to the screen and are thus only a few feet from the Holy Table itself; also, as has been said, a good part of the services takes place in the body of the church. One can also say from experience that, given the peculiar corporateness of Orthodox worship, there is no sense of being cut off from what is going on. Behind the screen the Holy Table itself stands free in the middle of the apse. It is square and has seven lamps or candles burning during the time of service (compare again the Jewish altar). To the left is the table of preparation, where the bread and wine offered by the faithful are prepared before the Liturgy begins.

By now, Vespers has begun, with a blessing: 'Blessed is our God, always, now and for ever, and unto the ages of ages.' There follows the censuring of the sanctuary, church and people during the singing of Psalm 104, which sets forth God's wisdom and majesty in creation. Next we hear a litany, the form of prayer which is specially characteristic of the eastern liturgies. Properly the deacon, but in his absence the priest, sings the invitations to prayer which cover all the needs of the Church and the world. To each the choir replies, 'Lord, have mercy' (*Kyrie eleison*) or 'Grant this, O Lord.' The litanies, long and short, usually end with a commemoration of the Mother of God and all the saints, and a commendation of 'ourselves and one another and all our life to Christ our God'. Meanwhile the priest is saying the 'secret' prayer appropriate to the particular litany, and concludes audibly with an ascription of worship to the Holy Trinity. There are at least three litanies during Vespers, and there may be as many as eleven in the holy Liturgy.

Vespers continues with psalmody (often, outside monasteries, selections from the proper psalms), with hymns of the feast or season and hymns in honour of the blessed Virgin, with the very ancient hymn to the Trinity, *φῶς ἑλαρόν*, and on the eves of certain feasts with lessons from the Old Testament. It closes with *Nunc dimittis*, with the customary prayers (which include the Trisagion, Our Father, and *Gloria*) and with the blessing.

The service of Matins and Hours takes place either after Vespers, or (more appropriately) in the morning before the Liturgy. Practice varies in the several national Churches. We will suppose that we are in Greece and that it is to be sung in the morning. It begins very early indeed, probably before we and most of the faithful arrive in church, and it is similar in structure and content, *mutatis mutandis*, to Vespers. We are careful to arrive in time for the reading of the Matins Gospel, which is followed by the hymn of the Resurrection—for it is

Sunday, and every Sunday commemorates the Resurrection—and the salutation by all present of the book of the Gospels and the holy icon of the feast. Then the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus* are sung and the hymn 'Glory be to God on high'; and the office ends with hymns of the feast, the customary prayers, litanies, the hymn to our Lady and the blessing.

The Divine Liturgy, as the Orthodox Christians call their Eucharist, is the centre and climax of all their worship. There are two forms of service in general use, the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom for Sundays and weekdays throughout the year, and that of St Basil, reserved for about ten days in the year. St John Chrysostom's Liturgy differs from St Basil's hardly at all in the audible parts, but considerably in the secret prayers of the priest. These liturgies have survived almost unchanged from about the sixth century or earlier.

Before the Liturgy, the holy Gifts are prepared in a special service at the table of preparation, behind the screen. Those parts of the loaves offered by the faithful which are not needed for consecration are later blessed and become the 'antidoron', distributed to those who have not communicated when they come to kiss the Cross at the end of the Liturgy.

The Liturgy and the other sacraments begin with a blessing different in form from that of the offices: 'Blessed is the Kingdom of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, now and ever . . .'; the sacraments are an earnest to Christians *in via* of the Kingdom of which they are citizens—truly, 'heaven on earth'. The blessing is followed by the great litany, beginning: 'In peace let us pray to the Lord.' The first part of the service, to which catechumens were admitted, consists of three litanies alternating with anthems, followed by the veneration of the book of the Gospels at the Little Entrance, the singing of the hymns of the day and the Trisagion, and then the epistle, gospel and sermon. Then, with further prayers in litany form, the catechumens were dismissed, for the instructional part of the service was over and at the ensuing mysteries no uninitiated person might participate. Nowadays most people are baptized in infancy, and in many Orthodox churches the service proceeds directly from the gospel to the prayers and hymns of the Great Entrance.

This, the beginning of the sacrifice, is prepared for by hymns and prayers of which the best-known is the hymn of the Cherubim. While this is sung, the holy Gifts are brought from the table of preparation out through the north door of the iconostase and through the body of the church in procession, with lights and incense. Before the Royal Doors the procession halts, the Gifts are raised on high, and intercession is made for Patriarch, bishop and clergy, for all rulers, for those in need or distress and for all present, that our Lord may remember them in His Kingdom. The holy Gifts are then carried through the Royal Doors to the holy Table and the doors are closed, the service continuing at once with another litany and the Creed of Nicaea.

The next part follows a familiar pattern: the eucharistic dialogue between priest and people ('Lift up your hearts. . .'), the association of those present with the worship of the angels ('Holy, Holy, Holy . . .'), the commemoration of the loving-kindness of God the Father and the narrative of the institution of the Lord's Supper. Then, having commemorated all the saving work of Christ, 'the Cross, the Grave, the Resurrection, the Ascension . . . the sitting at the right hand of the Father, and the coming again in glory', the priest makes the offering:

'Thine
solemn
bread
Blood
At the
secreta
Church
the M
asking
prayer
lifting
are ho
Christ
The
of pre
the C
chalic
munic
name
by fa
Comm
imme
The
remov
the h
the lo
of the
worsh
God,
blesse

'Thine of Thine own we offer Thee, in all and for all.' The next prayer is a solemn calling upon God to send the Holy Spirit on the Gifts 'and make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ . . . and what is in this cup the precious Blood of Thy Christ . . . Thou by Thy Holy Spirit having wrought the change'. At this point many of the faithful kneel or prostrate themselves. The consecration is followed by intercession, general and particular, for the whole Church, beginning with the saints and faithful departed. A hymn in honour of the Mother of God is sung during the Intercession, and is followed by a Litany asking acceptance for our gifts at God's heavenly altar; this introduces the Lord's prayer, sung or recited on behalf of the people. Further prayers lead to the lifting up of the holy Bread, with the words, 'The holy Things unto them that are holy!', to which the people's reply is: 'One is holy, one is Lord, Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father.'

The Communion of priest and people follows; it is preceded by three prayers of preparation and accompanied by the singing of appropriate anthems. After the Communion of the clergy the consecrated particles of bread are put into the chalice, and the laity receive both kinds together, from a spoon. Holy Communion is received standing, and is administered to each communicant by name; in general, people communicate rather infrequently, and prepare carefully by fasting and confession. Young children and babies are also admitted to Communion, for they receive chrismation—corresponding to confirmation—immediately after baptism.

The service ends with hymns and prayers of thanksgiving, and with the removal, with a gesture of benediction, of the chalice and its contents from the holy Table. The final blessing asks the mercy and salvation of our Lord, the lover of men, through the intercession of all the saints, mentioning many of them by name. It is a fitting conclusion to the joyful (often, exultant) act of worship which the Liturgy is: pre-eminently an actualization of the Kingdom of God, a participation of the faithful on earth in the ceaseless worship of all the blessed before the throne of God and of the Lamb.

JOAN FORD

THE MASS

'THOU art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' Here are two statements of a situation. The first is a statement about history; the second is an act of faith. The situation is that one man (lately a fisherman) faces another (not long since a carpenter) and in Him discovers the fulfilment of history and sees the vision of God. This was a real situation; it actually happened. No practising Catholic entertains any doubt that both statements are simply and without qualification true, true therefore and contemporary at all times, all the days to the end of the world. This Presence is the Fulness. Christ is the consummation of history: He is the whole realized intent of the Creator in creating—to sum up all things in Christ':

It was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell; and through him to reconcile all things unto himself . . . whether things upon the earth or things in the heavens. And you . . . now hath He reconciled in the body of his flesh through death to present you holy and without blemish and unrepveable before him.

This 'presenting holy and without blemish' is the definition itself of Sacrifice.

The primitive Church [says Dom Gregory Dix] said that because the eucharist is essentially an action and the church in doing that action is simply Christ's Body performing His will, the eucharistic action is necessarily His action of sacrifice and what is offered must be what He offered. The consequences of His action are what He declared they would be: 'This is My Body' and 'This is My Blood'. . . . The unity of the church's eucharist with the sacrifice of Christ by Himself is one consequence of the general pre-Nicene insistence on the unity of Christ with the Church of the Head with the members in one indivisible organism.

This act of fulfilment and reconciliation is the act of God, and it is complete. Love's redeeming work is done. Thou art the Christ: we do not look for another. Thou art not past, which is no longer; nor future which is not yet; not eternal only, for there is also time, and in the fulness of time thou art born of a woman. Thou art now and here—that which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld and our hands handled of the Word of life. When the Word who is God is made flesh, God has nothing more to say. He has united Man to God. History thenceforth is relevant to the consummate silence of the Godhead; the human is human as it is called and transfigured in this Agape. The Spirit, who is the Love subsisting between the Father and the Son and proceeding eternally between them from Glory to Glory, carries in His procession all that He creates and makes vital (since first He moved upon the face of the deep and said, Let there *be*) all His Body, so that His Body shall express not only man's love for God, but also God's love for God. We behold the glory of the Lord and are changed from glory to glory even as from the Lord the Spirit.

*Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus
Dominus Deus Sabaoth
Pleni sunt coeli et terra
Gloria tua*

The words of this liturgy were heard and its vision was seen in the year that King Uzziah died, many centuries before the angel announced the Saviour's nativity to the shepherds. They are spoken as in Heaven so on earth. Now and here we can go to Heaven or Bethlehem, Galilee or Golgotha, or wheresoever His members are all together in one place, and see this thing that is come to pass which the Lord hath made known unto us.

*Being's Source begins to be
And God Himself is born.*

We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory. Perhaps most wonderful of all is that we can speak to Thee, offering our varying gifts, our farthings and cups of cold water, our thoughts and our meals, since 'Jesus is our brother now and God is all our own'. The Church which is His Body is never estranged from Him, is never even visited by Him; it is His fulness, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. It is His presence, His parousia. Nothing can separate us from the Love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Nothing, for it is well to remember that when St Paul spoke of beholding the glory of the Lord and being changed from glory to glory, he was addressing a church of sinners, whose hates, lusts, drunkenness and idolatrous habits were well known to him. He cherished no illusions about them, nor of their fitness fondly dreamed. The divine Agape did not wait for human virtue or do without it, but created it. This was not a contractual relation; there were no bargains, no substitute observances or discreet concealments such as the Lord described as 'hypocrisy'. The sinners had, indeed, to cross the threshold into the community, but thereupon they were saved by grace and being saved were gracious. The home in which they learned these manners was the home of the Blessed Trinity. Their norm of fatherhood was the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Their name was His name. With Him they were heirs of His estate. They were to enter into His joy and sit down on His throne. When you touched them you touched Him. There was a covenant; it was a covenant in His blood. If their bodies were unchaste, His Body was profaned. When they quarrelled, it was natural to ask, Is Christ divided? The answer was: No, Christ is not divided; He is crucified.

This is what Catholics mean by Sacrament. It is Christ in action, an event in Christ, a deed which declares the union of the divine and human natures in His person. You are born of water and of the Spirit, die with Him, rise with Him, are united with Him and walk in newness of life—are in short *baptized*. You grow up and hold responsible and intelligent intercourse with your fellows, not *your* intercourse, nor *your* fellows, but a communion of the Holy Spirit and a co-operation into the Gospel—in fact you are *confirmed*. You are *married* as the Son of God is married to His Ecclesia: the Church is adorned for Him as a bride for her husband. And, says Aquinas, 'the consummation of the Spiritual life and the end of all the sacraments is the Eucharist, for by the hallowings of all the sacraments preparation is made for receiving or consecrating the Eucharist.'¹ What then is the Eucharist? It is the whole of Love's redeeming work, not the likeness or memorial of it merely, but the work itself, the Incarnation and the Sacrifice, the glorious Resurrection and Ascension, the coming of the Holy

Ghost. 'Thereby', says St John of Damascus, 'we assume the Godhead of the Son.' It is the sacrament, says Aquinas, 'of Christ's passion, as everyone is made perfect in union with Christ who suffered. . . . It is the sacrament of charity (agape) which is the bond of perfectness.'

The difference [he says] between bodily and spiritual food lies in this, that bodily food is changed into the substance of the person nourished . . . but spiritual food changes man into itself, as Augustine said that he heard the voice of Christ, as it were, saying to him, Nor shalt thou change Me into thyself as food for thy flesh, but thou shalt be changed into Me.

And this is the logic of Sacrifice, a purpose different from that of human self-realization and perfection, which has constantly used the offices and discipline of religion to emancipate, enrich and ennoble human beings. The monks, for instance, taught barbarians the dignity of work, the reality of time, the common discipline and common sense by which wandering freebooters became responsible citizens; they laid the foundations of mediaeval economy, were farmers, architects and scholars; were employed, when no one else was literate or disinterested, in imperial and royal administration; they preserved literature and a tradition of learning. This country never disowned the benefit received from its Benedictine conquerors in the seventh century. Paulinus, from what little we know of him, seems to have been a man like John Wesley, with a like story of social creativeness. Again, the modern world, for better or worse, is dominated by the scientific method discovered in the fourteenth century by theologians who revolted from Aristotelian cosmology, which as theologians they had studied. We need not to be reminded of our incalculable debt to the Puritan of the seventeenth century, or to the Methodist of the nineteenth, or to be told how much the history of the English people is the history of the English Church. But all this can be assessed by the secular historian as profit. This food is changed into the substance of the person nourished. Ye seek Me because ye ate of the loaves and were filled, and it is a good reason for seeking Him. But what of those who find? At this level, their religion has made men human; but Christ is to make them holy. Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you. At the root and heart of all these profits and services of religion which enrich human life, and sometimes obscured by them, is the absolute initiative of the living God which the New Testament calls Grace. This Grace is not of debt like wages; it is not reached by legal logic nor explicable as an evolutionary process; but, like the creation of the world for His blessing and of man in His image, it is His act of love. 'The only begotten Son of God intending to make us partakers of the divine nature took our nature on Himself, becoming man that He might make men gods.'³

To become man is the function and indeed the definition of food, and if God becomes man, ever thus far His act resembles that of food. But whereas bodily food achieves its end and is extinguished in the man whom it sustains, the divine sustenance becomes man to make man divine. We live *by* food; what do we live *for*? No man ever achieved his destiny nor had it in his heart to conceive it. We know not what we shall be; but we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is. With such ignorance, the divine darkness of faith, the Creed which we

recite
Deum
it is a

who
first
is the
Bethl
lives
We d
franc
disso
Love
of ou
mani
'I liv

So
whic
prese
Chris
deter
auth
altar
At th
Victi
Love
the c
reach
speci
to th
of m

For
the v
of th
the l
Fath

So
offer
'H
crea
and
who
tion
have
fish

recite at the threshold of the Sacrifice plunges us *into* God. *Credo in unum Deum*, we say—'I believe into one God'. By faith I plunge me in this sea, and it is an infinite, a bottomless abyss; I am swallowed up in it:

*Plunged in the Godhead's deepest sea
And lost in Thine immensity,*

who for us men and for our salvation came down from Heaven. Here for the first time after its opening 'I believe', the Creed uses an indicative mood. This is the first historical event, and though we hear angels announce it and go to Bethlehem and see it, though at His invitation we follow Him to see where He lives and what manner of death He dies, who will tell us what that event really is? We do not know, we do not understand; we believe and adore. The conceptual frame which may compose our picture of the universe or our image of Jesus dissolves in the *mysterium fidei*. We can see what human eyes can see, but the Love which has come to redeem us and raise us to the Godhead has bereft us of our eyesight and our self-serving intelligence. Like men born blind to manifest the creative work of God, we shall have to use His eyes to see with. 'I live, yet no longer I but Christ.'

Somehow that transubstantiation must be accomplished. The earthly bread which sustains my self must be changed into the Body of Him in whom I am presented without blemish before the face of His glory. 'The presence of Christ's true body and blood in this sacrament', says Aquinas, 'cannot be detected by sense nor understanding, but by faith alone which rests upon divine authority.' He is the author of both faith and sacrament, and we go unto the altar of God to become part not only of His Sacrifice, but of Him sacrificing. At this heart of God there are no types and symbols. There is one Priest, one Victim, and He is with us all the days; one present divine event of redeeming Love, and this event happens now, in every now, for every me. St Peter and the eleven were no more with the Lord Jesus than I am, and though I cannot reach hither my finger and see His hands, yet it is all of His courtesy that the species of bread and wine which veil His presence should be at once His tribute to the sacred weakness of my earthly senses (which He gave me) and the occasion of my faith (which He authorizes and inspires).

For the bread of God is that which cometh down out of heaven and giveth life unto the world. . . . I am the living bread which came down out of heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; yea and the bread which I shall give is my flesh for the life of the world. . . . As the living Father hath sent me and I live because of the Father, so he that eateth me shall live because of me.

So we proceed to the Sacrifice, as it is in the liturgy, set forth in three stages of offering, consecration and communion.

'His disciples offer to God', said Irenaeus. 'The first fruits of his own creation'; and in the primitive Church the faithful brought their bread and wine and water to the Deacon, who presented them to the Bishop, since the Bishop who was to consecrate these offerings represented not only the local congregation but the whole Church of God. And besides the fruits of His creation, men have offered many strange gifts to the Lord. Once they had five loaves and two fishes, and He said, Bring them hither to me; but at other times they brought

the blind, the lame, the palsied and the epileptic, the woman taken in adultery; they brought a reed, a purple robe, a crown of thorns, a cross. We bring our varying gifts to Thee and Thou rejectest none. Now the water and the wine are brought to the sacrificing priest who himself brings the bread, 'the spotless host which I Thy unworthy servant offer unto Thee'. He blesses the water, mixes it with the wine in the chalice, and prays that 'by the mystical union of this water and wine, we may be made partakers of His divinity who vouchsafed to partake of our humanity'. The priest holds up the chalice of salvation . . . for our own salvation and that of the whole world', and prays in humility and contrition that God may accept the sacrifice to be offered. *Veni Sanctificator*—Come Thou who makest holy. He washes his hands in innocency; 'So will I compass Thine altar, O Lord'. Being priest he is also mediator between God and man; he addresses the Trinity, kisses the altar and turns to the congregation. 'Pray for me, brethren', he says, 'that my and your sacrifice may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty.'

This, you see, is all ourselves making our offering, doing our best. The matter of the Sacrament must be such as we would give Him, unblemished, liturgically pure. When the preparation is complete, the priest and congregation hold a dialogue:

*The Lord be with you,
And with Thy Spirit.
Lift up your hearts.
We lift them up unto the Lord.
Let us give thanks to our Lord God.
It is meet and just.*

And the Consecration, the Canon of the Mass, has begun. It is one long prayer. Its history is as old as Christendom and as wide as the Church. It is told by Dom Gregory Dix. I can only draw attention to what will be found in any Roman missal as we use it. We began with gratitude, sharing in the praise of angels and archangels and all the company of heaven, in the song of the archangels, *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus*, and in the welcome of all the multitude of Zion. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. At each major feast of the liturgical year, a preface breaks in to name the peculiar matter for thanksgiving—at Christmas the mystery of the Word made flesh, at Easter that Christ is sacrificed, for He is the true Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world. Then from the Church triumphant the prayer gathers up the Church militant, and offers the oblation through Jesus Christ our Lord

Who the day before He suffered took bread into His holy and venerable hands and with His eyes lifted up towards heaven unto Thee, God, His almighty Father, giving thanks to Thee, blessed broke and gave to His disciples, saying, Take and eat ye all of this, for this is My Body, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*.

In like manner, after He had supped, taking also this glorious Chalice into His holy and venerable hands and giving thanks to Thee, He blessed and gave to His disciples, saying: Take and drink ye all of this, for this is the Chalice of My Blood, of the new and eternal testament; the mystery of faith; which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins: *Hic est enim Calix sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei: qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*.

As oft as ye shall do these things, ye shall do them in remembrance of Me.

The whole Church is silent. The Lord has come. Our oblation is no longer ours but His, not only His but He. Mindful of Thy blessed Passion and also Thy Resurrection and Ascension, we Thy servants and also Thy holy people offer to Thy glorious Majesty of Thy gifts a pure Sacrifice, a holy Sacrifice, a spotless Sacrifice, the holy Bread of eternal life and the Chalice of everlasting salvation. By Him and with Him and in Him is all honour and glory to Thee, God the Father almighty in the unity of the Holy Spirit for ever and ever.

Yet it may seem a strange thing that, among angels and archangels and all the company of heaven, the holy centre upon which time and eternity meet and embrace are the two simplest and most directly carnal sentences in the Gospel: This is My Body; This is My Blood. To them the whole adoration of the Church has moved through all its centuries. None of the other words were like this—the great sermon, the parables, the discourses and the prayer in St John. They open immeasurable horizons; they speak of the kingdom of heaven, of My peace, My joy and the glory which I had with Thee before the world was. Visions, promises, commandments, teaching, words of infinite compassion and boundless invitation. But here in the heart of them all, the poetry of heaven is silent. I remember the shattering sense of the divine Presence that swept over me once when I knelt beside an idiot and saw the priest lay the Host upon his tongue and close his mouth for him. Dante saw paradise and St Paul in the seventh heaven heard words which it is not lawful for man to utter. You and I have been converted and experienced the glorious liberty of the children of God. Men are beings of great stature; they can listen to the Son of Man and understand His words. But this only God can do—become flesh, and take the flesh into His Godhead. He alone created that which eats to live, that which eats of Christ to live with God. The Communion is not a fact, for facts are words. It is an event. We dare to say Our Father, 'formed by divine institution', the prayer which starts with the song of the angels and descends to the hunger of poor folk and the debtors' prison and the cry of the lost. We dare to say Our Father because Jesus is all our own. We eat the bread which came down from heaven and we are all His own. We feel like the Centurion whose words we use: Lord I am not worthy that Thou shouldest enter under my roof. But He does enter and it is not my roof any more. Here is the whole mystery, the natural world and God who loves it, the human nature so glorious by nature that God embraced it, obedient unto death, yea the death of the Cross—the whole mystery, not in words which human insight can penetrate, but in act and grace divine as the creation, inevitable as the love of God. In his final thanksgiving the priest declares that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

*With solemn faith we offer up,
And spread before Thy glorious eyes,
That only ground of all our hope,
That precious, bleeding sacrifice,
Which calls Thy grace on sinners down,
And perfects all our souls in one.*

T. S. GREGORY

¹ Sum. Theo I. 73. 3.

² Commentary on St John, 12.

THE WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

THE Church of England has some claim to be the most genuinely 'congregational' Church in Christendom. Its services are contained in a book which is put in the hands of every worshipper, so that he can not only follow, but take part in the prayers and praises that are being offered. The spiritual truths contained in these services are not only founded on, but are to be tested by, the Bible itself; and for the better testing, an open Bible is set ready to the layman's hand and eye in every Anglican church. The church itself is not open only upon Sunday for worship directed by a minister, but stands open throughout the week as God's house, making all His children welcome, however they come and whoever they be. The minister himself is bidden to be at the service of every 'parishioner', whether or no he be a worshipper. And, finally, the whole Church is under the eye of a House of Commons, consisting of Christians of every opinion, of Jews, of agnostics, and of atheists.

Nothing could be further from the idea of 'priestcraft', an idea which is equally pernicious whether it incline to the idea of the priest as being entirely apart from normal humankind, performing special functions and possessing an absolute authority, or whether it prefer spellbinding 'popular preachers', where authority, equally arbitrary, often rests upon a man rather than upon the Word made known through him.

The worship of the Church of England is, in fact, *Church* worship, the offering of the whole laity, the people of God, whether expressed on Sunday in word and sacrament, or on weekdays in action, in the home, and in associations in fellowship.

It begins in the home. For the sake of a home in Nazareth, every home is sacred. Because of a Holy Family in Bethlehem, *every* family is holy. This leads to what is sometimes thought of as a lax view of marriage and baptism, a careless lading out of sacramental grace without the discipline of Church membership.

But the Church of England believes that it *is* the Church of the English people, charged to be just that so long as 'establishment' continues. Let it be 'disestablished'. Very well, then; it will be freed from any moral obligation for those who are not practising members. But whilst it is still given a responsibility, it cannot escape it. That responsibility is to offer all it can of recognition and blessing to those who are trying, however inadequately, to find a way home to God. The very fact that they ask—for marriage, for baptism, for a funeral—is a kind of 'justification by faith', a sort of self-committal.

Indeed, so far from withdrawing from the home into the citadel of the ecclesiastical building, the whole tendency of our time is for the Church to invade the home. The encouragement after long lapse of family grace before meals, of family prayers, of the blessing of new houses or housing estates is as much part of the process as is the 'House-Church' made familiar from Canon Southcott's work at Leeds.

Something of the same sort—though working, as it were, inwards rather than outwards—is seen in those innumerable experiments in the 'Parish Communion' to be found in every sort of parish. Here the family as a unit—parents, children, infants-in-arms—all come to the communion rail together,

but the children not yet confirmed stand behind their parents, being present at, instead of participating in, the sacrament. This is all worship in terms of home and family—a hallowing of daily life, a recognition that human ties of blood are holy.

Along with it goes the recognition of the greater family loyalties—not only to the local Church (the family, as it were, at home) but to the *world* Church, the cousins in Australia, the brothers in Africa, the great uncle in China. Worship emphasizes our kinship with them, not as poor relations, to whom we send Christmas charity or cast-off clothing, but as fellow-users of our Prayer Book, sharers in the pattern of our worship, praying for us as we pray for them. And here we find the advantage of having *one* printed Prayer Book and *no* common hymn-book. For our prayer book, as will be stated hereafter, is scriptural, and so, we believe, universal; but our hymn-books collect the whole range of spiritual contribution and musical offering that lies between the genius of Charles Wesley and, let us say, of Chinese folk-music. Each age and each culture is constantly throwing up new expressions of its changing need and of God's eternal answer, and so no hymn-book can be for us final and definitive; if it were, we should run the risk of denying the Spirit in some new expression of His creating personality.

With this fusion of the traditional and the contemporary goes the changing form of our churches. They are an outward expression of the inward fact, a kind of Incarnation of what we believe, a static offering of worship. That is why they are designed, not as auditoria or lecture halls, places where *men* will listen to a *man*, but as places in which man may look at God in humility and adoration. For this very reason, we try to make them as 'unfamiliar' as possible. Our home, with its family prayers, is for the familiar; the Church is to speak to us of the glory and otherness of God. It is designed from the sanctuary outwards, rather than from the nave inwards. It is only when we begin to bother too much about 'ceremonial'—that is, about man's share in worship—that this central truth, the Infinite Wonder of God's dwelling among men, is sometimes forgotten.

This recognition of the importance of the artist and the craftsman, no less than the awareness of the whole family of God as sharing in our worship, brings us back to the fact that our daily work is a vital part of that worship. Our forefathers, of course, knew this. It was as natural to them to launch a ship with prayer as to christen a baby. Their trade-guilds represented a total fusion of two forms of service, to God and to man. The members served one another as loyal comrades; but they also served the public, their customers, with a high-minded integrity; and in doing both these things, they knew they were serving God. That is why the crafts were 'mysteries'—ways, as St Paul understood so well, in which man comprehends something of the workings of God Himself.

The Industrial Revolution, the acceptance of *laissez-faire*, the horizontal stratification of society and industry alike, so poisoned this earlier faith that for a time it hardly survived. But today it has risen from its bed of sickness. More and more we come to see that 'profit, power, and promotion' are not the only incentives for which man will work, that a service in church and service on the job are akin in more than name alone.

We thank God, therefore, that we have in the sacramental pattern of Holy

Communion (of its form we shall speak later) a politic that is, or can be, more uniting than Communism, and one which, unlike Communism, recognizes both man's material self and his dependence upon a Bread which is much more than material. This Bread stands to us for the transfiguration of our daily life, by its offering to God, just as the wine of that same service hallows for us all those earthly joys of which it reminds us. We take back from God the offering we have made, and through His own self-offering it becomes to us the sign of daily life glorified and made Eternal.

But all these forms of worship depend, in the end, upon our common use of the *Book of Common Prayer*, upon a pattern which, by and large, in spite of all our infidelities and experiments, we all accept. The Church of England has been called 'the Church of the Book'. So it is, but not so much the Church of the Prayer Book, as the Church of the Bible. That is to say, those essential services of morning and evening prayer which were compiled by Cranmer out of the monastic offices were made up almost entirely out of portions of the Bible. And they were intended for the daily personal use of the laity as well as for the daily public use of the clergy. They were, in fact, the first organized system of Bible readings, and are therefore the ancestor of the Bible Reading Fellowship, the Scripture Union, and all others of the same sort. Those who criticize these services as being too formal and as limiting devotions of minister and people are therefore in effect saying that the reading of the Bible is a limiting activity, and that they would prefer to rely on their own constant inspiration.

The use of morning and evening prayer—involving the recitation of the psalms throughout the month, and of a sizeable proportion of the Bible in a year—aimed at making the people familiar with that foundation of the faith. Along with this, went the provision of the Bible in English set up in every church so that all who wished could come and study it for themselves. The pattern of these two services then is scriptural, but it is also historical. In each, man is at first confronted with his own sin, and then through the history of the world's redemption, is brought to the point where as a member of a community he is called upon to play his part in praying for that community. His words may sometimes be old-fashioned, but the sentiments are eternal. It is well worth remembering, in this matter of language, that the "Thee" and "Thou" of Prayer Book and Bible usage are the intimate and familiar address still surviving in every language except our own. It is the greatest pity that to us they have become only formal and archaic. What was originally the speech of a child talking to the parent has become the formal address of a subject to a sovereign.

The *Book of Common Prayer* also contains the two great sacramental offices of Baptism and Holy Communion. With Baptism should be linked Confirmation, for they are the two parts of one service of Christian initiation. Each part contains the same continuing elements—first, penitence, or the desire to be done with the sinful past; second, a profession of faith; third, the divine grace expressed in outward form; fourth, the welcome of the congregation. It would take too long to examine this in detail, but much of the present confusion in Anglican thinking about infant baptism comes from the failure to integrate these two parts of one continuing activity, or to overstress one feature out of the four.

It has always been realized that the service of Holy Communion (under

whatever name) is the central act of the Church's worship. It was a tragic and misunderstood deduction from this fact that led to the demand (under the various Test Acts) for a certificate of Communicant attendancy from those who would hold any state office. And because it is the central act of worship, it is practised in variations of a common form according to the differences in outlook of groups within the Church of England. In all of them, however, there is common agreement that this is a matter of faith rather than analysis. In that verse attributed to Elizabeth I, we believe—

*He was the Word that spoke it;
He took the bread and brake it;
And what that Word doth make it,
That I believe and take it.*

In other words, we accept this sacrament as the means through which God gives Himself to us and we in turn offer ourselves to Him. Here the word 'ourselves' is extremely important. The many experiments in 'parish communions' and so on are all efforts to restore the sense of fellowship, of a hallowing of all human life in place of a solitary pietism. And here we come to what any united Church must one day face as a crux in its thinking. Is the Sacrament something to be offered as a means of grace to all those who come forward to receive it, or is it the outward sign of the inner unity linking previous Church members? The Anglican Church has always held that the latter is the scriptural view. It has therefore restricted participation to those who are confirmed, not with the intention of excluding Christians of other denominations, but to make clear to its *own* adherents that without the witness and discipline of Confirmation they are incomplete members and unable to join in the chief expression of that membership.

In conclusion, then, the English Church, like the English people, is often eccentric, inconsistent and unduly conservative. At the same time it has a deep sense of history, of identity with the past, no less than with the future. It maintains that its beliefs are scriptural through and through, but it seeks to express the eternal certainties of scripture in accordance with the revelations of truth, whether in history, art, or science. Sadly as it has been lacking—and is still lacking—in charity and fervour, it somehow has retained a compassion and kindness that are very precious. Like an old-fashioned garden it contains flowers which range from tropical splendours to the most temperate simplicity, but all manage to live together in amity. And this is perhaps its greatest contribution to the Church Universal that one day by God's mercy will be.

STEPHAN HOPKINSON

METHODISM AND THE MEANS OF GRACE

WITHIN the apse of Wesley's Chapel is a marble tablet erected to commemorate John Wesley. The inscription was written by Dr John Whitehead, who had been a travelling preacher for seven years before he retired to practise medicine in Finsbury Square. He became John Wesley's friend, physician, and executor, and was invited to preach his funeral sermon. In the noble words of the inscription, Dr Whitehead paid tribute to:

A man in learning and sincere piety
scarcely inferior to any;
in zeal, ministerial labours and extensive usefulness,
Superior, perhaps, to all men, since the days of St Paul.

It is a pity that there is no record of the artist who carved this memorial tablet, for of all the many characterizations of John Wesley and his work none surpasses the insight of a sermon in stone which is carved on its pediment. In the centre of the carving is the globe, for the world was John Wesley's parish. It is appropriate that the portion of the globe which confronts the eye is the Atlantic Ocean with its many shores. Protruding from behind the globe are the two Biblical symbols of a winged trumpet and a shepherd's crook, for Wesley's labours combined equally the work of preacher and pastor. It is important, however, to notice that in this carving the world is held in its place by two books: one is the Bible and the other is the Liturgy of the Church of England. This signifies that for a proper understanding of Methodism in history and in the world today it is essential to remember that the Evangelical Revival was also a revival of that private prayer and corporate worship upon which the souls of many generations of Christians had been fed. The revival resulting from the proclamation of the gospel of grace was sustained and kept alive by the provision of the means of grace.

It is one of the strange ironies and misfortunes of history that there have been times and places when Methodism has been represented as an opponent of the very things for which John Wesley so stoutly contended. To see but part of our Founder's greatness and to exaggerate it by ignoring another part is but to caricature him. There has, alas! been evidence in our history for those who, like Reinhold Niebuhr, have dubbed Methodism a 'belated, pietistic, evangelistic sect of the eighteenth century', but that is a caricature which is not substantiated by a knowledge of our historical source documents. As a matter of fact, it was precisely because of Wesley's inflexible opposition to the pietistic sects of the eighteenth century that Methodism became a separate organization and developed its own ethos. Indeed, Wesley's uncompromising affirmation of catholic doctrine and the traditional means of grace so distinguished him from the rest of the evangelical movements of the eighteenth century that he was more frequently suspected as a Papist than a Pietist!

The struggle with the Pietists began immediately after Wesley's Aldersgate Street experience. At that time both John and Charles were members of the religious society which met in Fetter Lane. This group was a society within the Church of England and, although it was greatly influenced by Moravian teaching, all its members professed allegiance to the doctrines and disciplines of the

Established Church. After two years Wesley quarrelled with its members precisely because he did not approve of their Pietistic and sectarian tendencies. The Moravian doctrine of 'stillness' disparaged, if it did not altogether dispense with the need for, private devotion and public worship, and it was for that very reason that, dressed in his cassock, gown and bands, John Wesley read a paper to the Fetter Lane Society on Sunday evening, 20th July 1740, condemning the tenets of the Pietists. Immediately after the paper was read, he and eighteen other members withdrew their persons and their membership from Fetter Lane to the Foundery in order that they might the better maintain the orthodox faith and practice of the Church of England!

It was about this time that John Wesley wrote and published his famous sermon on the Means of Grace, which was then, and still is, definitive of Methodist doctrine. He writes:

By 'Means of Grace' I understand outward signs, words, or actions, ordained of God, and appointed for this end, to be the ordinary channels whereby He might convey to men, preventing, justifying or sanctifying grace.

I must use this expression 'Means of Grace', because I know of none better; and because it has been generally used in the Christian Church for many ages—in particular by our own Church, which directs us to bless God both for the means of grace and the hope of glory, and teaches us that a sacrament is 'an outward sign of inward grace, and a means whereby we receive the same'.

The chief of these means are prayer, whether in secret or with the great congregation; searching the Scriptures (which implies reading, hearing, and meditating thereon) and receiving the Lord's Supper, eating bread and drinking wine in remembrance of Him: and these we believe to be ordained of God, as the ordinary channels of conveying His grace to the souls of men.

We may, therefore, clarify our thought by saying that in the Methodist tradition, the essential means of grace are prayer, whether secret or with the great congregation, searching the Scriptures (reading, hearing, and meditating) and partaking of the Lord's Supper.

Although this sermon was written in such a definite historical context, the fact that it was chosen to be one of the forty-four Standard Sermons for Methodist doctrine shows that this was one of the many points of orthodoxy on which Wesley never wavered. The same is borne out by Sermon 101 on 'The Duty of Constant Communion', which has a most significant Preface which reads:

The following Discourse was written above five and fifty years ago, for the use of my pupils at Oxford. I have added very little, but retrenched much; as I then used more words than I do now. But, I thank God, I have not yet seen cause to alter my sentiments in any point which is therein delivered.

J. W., 1788

In this sermon, which epitomizes the teaching of a lifetime, Wesley adduces as reasons for proclaiming the duty of constant Communion, first, that it is the plain command of Christ, and secondly, that the benefits are so great. He concludes:

Whoever, therefore, does not receive, but goes from the Holy Table, when all things are prepared, either does not understand his duty or does not care for the dying

command of his Saviour, the forgiveness of his sins, the strengthening of his soul, and the refreshing it with the hope of glory.

Nor should we forget that in early Methodism a use of the Means of Grace accompanied the preaching of the gospel of grace. During a generation in which the Bishop of Oxford was recommending his clergy to add a fourth celebration of Holy Communion to the three customarily observed at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, Wesley himself was communicating on the average about twice a week throughout his ministry. Throughout the Methodist Revival, the preaching of the Word was accompanied by the regular use and advocacy of the Means of Grace. In 1743 Wesley acquired the use of the West Street Chapel in London, and of the services there on 29th May he wrote: 'I preached . . . and administered the Lord's Supper to some hundreds of communicants.' Thirty years later we read of similar impressive services; 650 communicants were at a service at Bristol in 1771, 700 at Leeds in 1779, and in May 1783 Wesley wrote: 'Such a sight I believe was never seen at Manchester before. It was supposed there were thirteen or fourteen hundred communicants, among whom there was such a spirit as I have seldom found, and their whole behaviour was such as adorned the Gospel.' One of his preachers wrote in 1763:

I had now an opportunity to receive the Holy Sacrament among the children of God. And to see the large and deeply serious congregations that attended the Chapels, and the uncommon number of communicants, their devout behaviour and the order with which the whole service was conducted, was highly pleasing to me. O how divinely pleasant and how truly profitable is it to wait upon God in His holy ordinances.

These great services depended on the presence of the band of ordained ministers who were part of the Methodist Movement, and they indicate a sometimes forgotten aspect of the Evangelical Revival. In the *Journal* for 25th December 1774 we read: 'During the twelve festival days we had the Lord's Supper daily: a little emblem of the Primitive Church. May we be the followers of them in all things as they were of Christ.'

The value of liturgical worship based on the Methodist *Book of Offices* can only be appreciated by those who are privileged to share in it regularly. Occasional liturgical worship is apt to be disconcerting, because it challenges the individualistic approach to God to which our 'free church' type of worship conditions us. But patient, regular, and humble practice of the traditional forms of more corporate prayer is very rewarding and leads to a better understanding of the words with which Dr Adam Clarke, that great scholar and preacher of early Methodism, commended the *Book of Common Prayer*:

This book I reverence next to the Word of God. . . . Had it not been for this book. . . I verily believe that Methodism had never existed. I see plainly that where we read these prayers our congregations become better settled, better edified, and put further out of the reach of false doctrine.

While this is an argument in favour of liturgical worship, it does not exclude change or development in our common prayer. On one occasion, John Wesley records, when he was elderly and unwell and had no one to assist him, he abbreviated the service so that it could be compassed within the space of

three hours. Most Methodist churches have continued this good work of abbreviation. There is very good reason for abbreviation and alteration, but a protest should be made against substituting for the traditional order of common prayer a service designed primarily to enable folk to have 'a good sing' or 'a good time'. This substitutes human enjoyment for the worship of Almighty God.

The Sunday morning service which customarily took John Wesley three hours was read from the *Book of Common Prayer*. It would include both Morning Prayer and Holy Communion and not infrequently the Litany as well. Methodists evidently got up earlier and spent more time in the worship of God in those days. It is a very great deprivation to Methodist evangelism and piety that the vast majority of our congregations neither know, understand nor desire to learn a way of worship which was the spiritual food of our forefathers and which has meant so much to so many generations of Christians.

Nevertheless, it may well be that the sorely-needed revival of corporate worship in Methodism will not come through the attempt to revive the use of Morning Prayer as it is printed in the Methodist *Book of Offices*; for although, in itself, the service is rich and simple, human ingenuity could hardly devise a more confusing way of printing it than is usually adopted. Perhaps, indeed, such a revival is not to be universally desired, because Morning Prayer was originally designed to be a weekday morning service, Sunday worship being according to the office for the Holy Communion. But the majority of Methodist services cannot be sacramental, and if they will not be liturgical, the main development of Methodist worship may have to follow other lines. Nevertheless, it should always observe the following principles:

1. Every service should contain a full diet of Christian worship in its prayer and song. This should always include

the adoration and praise of God;
the penitence and supplication of the worshippers;
the glad acceptance of God's offered forgiveness;
the intercession of the congregation for the needs of others.

2. Every service should be truly scriptural by including lections from both the Old and New Testaments, and it is a great advantage if these follow a Lectionary. The sermon should usually be an exposition of part of one of the appointed lections.

3. Every service should make good use of the vast and largely unknown treasury of worship in the *Methodist Hymn-book*. Perhaps a smaller number of complimentary remarks about martyrs of earlier days and a braver choice of the better but less well-known hymns of Methodism would be a good thing for the Church.

A devout observance by ministers and local preachers of at least these points would greatly enrich our weekly worship. But there is another task which ministers alone can perform and that is the restoration of the Holy Communion to its rightful place in our worship.

There is such a widespread neglect, abuse and belittling of the Service of Holy Communion throughout Methodism today that it is little wonder that our

witness is so weak and our evangelism so powerless. We cannot preach the gospel of grace effectively without the Means of Grace. Holy Communion should never be observed as an afterthought tacked on to 'the main service'. It *is* the main service of Christian worship, and although our Church has a long way to go before this is the accepted practice, much can be done by any minister who decides to end this neglect and impoverishment of our corporate spiritual life. I am reminded of a few lines which Professor E. G. Rupp once wrote:

'Well, we've had a nice little service,' chirruped a modern Methodist to the minister at the close of a great Easter celebration. Nice! Little! That is a vast distance from Charles Wesley's—

*The altar streams with sacred blood
And all the temple flames with God.*

The blame for such banal remarks does not lie at the door of the laymen. The whole Methodist Church will remain impoverished in theology, discipline and evangelism until there is a revival of real worship in our midst.

RONALD V. SPIVEY

THE LITURGY OF THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA¹

At the union in 1947 there was no intention to set about compiling a special service of the Lord's Supper. However, as the Church began to grow together, there was a desire to express in worship the unity now transcending the differences. In particular, it was felt that some common form was desirable when those of different traditions met at the Lord's Table on synodical and other occasions. Which of the several current forms was to be used? Accordingly, in 1949, the Liturgy Committee was asked to draft a service which might be used at the Synod of 1950. The Committee first considered adapting the order of the Book of Common Prayer, already in wide use in differing versions. Then it was thought better to try to prepare a new form, incorporating the nine parts required in the Constitution, and following certain guiding principles, viz.: (a) The expression of faith in worship must be in accord with scripture. (b) The service must be an act of the whole people and as complete as possible, neither an early act for the pious few nor an apocopated epilogue secondary to the preaching service. (c) Features dear to each tradition must be preserved as far as possible. (d) It must be apt for use in India.

On this basis a draft was drawn up, revised on the basis of comments from the

Dioceses, and used at the Synod. The Liturgy was at once seen to be a good gift of God and was approved for optional and experimental use. After such use, in English and the vernaculars, and in the light of criticisms received in India and from experts overseas, the service was subjected, in 1953, to very careful revision. It proved to have worn well and little beyond general simplification and neatening was found necessary. This was the more remarkable in that what a friendly outsider has called 'your incomparable Liturgy' was drawn up, under God, by a group of men who would hardly call themselves liturgiologists. It was dramatic evidence of the fruit of union. J. R. Macphail speaks for all when he describes it as 'a very solid thing, simple enough for most people to follow; comprehensive enough to surprise, rebuke and comfort, at every experience of it. It is very much of a piece: it is not any particular thing said or done by the celebrant, but all that is done by all, that makes it effective. It arises out of a sense of mission and unity and seems likely under God to strengthen that sense.'²

THE Liturgy falls into three clear parts: THE PREPARATION; THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD OF GOD; THE BREAKING OF THE BREAD.³ Furthermore, in order to stress the solemnity of the act and to give opportunity for instruction in its meaning, provision is made for a service to be held at some convenient time before each celebration. It includes praise, confession, the 'Warrant' of 1 Corinthians 11²³⁻⁹, the Commandments and an exhortation.

I

The service proper begins with an act of PREPARATION for right reception. During the singing of a hymn the celebrant comes to the Table, spread simply with a white cloth, and lays the Bible thereon. It is recommended that, where possible, he follow the ancient custom of standing behind the Table that the action of the service may be clearly seen and that the whole congregation gather round the Table. All stand for the *Collect for Purity* stressing that all prayer is in and through the Holy Spirit, and for the *Gloria*, placed here rather than at the end, to lead the worshippers from the vision of God's glory to penitence. If no previous service has been held, the *Warrant*, *Commandments*, etc., may be used here.

The *Invitation to Confession* is followed by silent meditation. Both the *Confession* (led by a member of the congregation) and the *Declaration of Forgiveness* stress Jesus' teaching that these who would receive forgiveness must be ready to offer it to others. In between comes *The Gracious Word of God* (an adaptation of 'The Comfortable Words' to meet certain difficulties as to the authorship of John 3¹⁶ and 1 Tim. 1¹⁵). If, however, the declaration is used as a prayer ('us' for 'you') it precedes the Gracious Word. There is further space for meditation. The Preparation ends with all saying: *Amen. Thanks be to God.*

II

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD opens with the ancient greeting: *The Lord be with you*, and the response, to link minister and people, and to mark a new stage in the service. Then comes the *Collect* for the day, chosen from ancient and modern sources, which with the *Readings* declares, in each year, the whole counsel of God, gathered round the central events of Christmas, Easter and Pentecost.⁴

It is usual for the people to stand for the whole reading of the Word—Old Testament, Epistle, and Gospel—and for members to share the reading. Brief responses after each passage stress that the hearing of the Word should issue in the praise of God.

The Sermon, not moral uplift or liturgical instruction, but the preaching of the Word, follows. In making this obligatory, the C.S.I. declares its belief that the ministry of the read and spoken Word is of equal status with that of the visible Word of the Sacrament.

The congregation then associates itself with the faith of the ages by saying the *Creed*, preferably the Nicene.

Now opportunity is given in the *Announcements* to bring in the concerns of the Church, and, unless alms have been placed, Indian fashion, in vessels at the door on entry, the *Collection* is taken.

This done, a member of the congregation leads the *Intercession*, with or without special biddings. There is choice between an adaptation to litany form of the Anglican prayer, and an abbreviation from the Liturgy of S James, long used in India, and as used at the Inauguration of C.S.I. The minister ends the intercession with a short prayer and gives the first *Benediction*. Children, catechumens, excommunicates, etc., now leave but all others are expected to stay for the Communion—the liturgy of the faithful.

III

THE BREAKING OF THE BREAD begins, all standing, with an act of Christian fellowship; first in scriptural words which declare that we have our true togetherness by participation in Christ; and then in *The Peace*, the passing through the congregation of a double hand-clasp in token of brotherly love. The purpose is to rise to that fellowship with Christ and His Church wherein alone the individual can make worthy self-offering.

During a hymn, alms and elements are brought to the minister by members, sometimes by families in turn. He places them on the Table and offers a simple prayer which makes it clear that the gifts are symbols of ourselves, and that we make our offering only in and through His. All kneel and say: *Be present, be present, O Jesus, thou good High Priest, as thou wast in the midst of thy disciples, and make thyself known to us in the breaking of the bread.* . . .

The *Eucharistic Prayer* begins with the *Greeting*, the *Sursum Corda*, and either a general *Preface* commemorating creation, or a *proper Preface* recalling the particular aspect of Revelation at each season of the Christian Year. The people join in: *Therefore with angels and archangels* . . . , and in the greeting to Christ when He entered Jerusalem on Palm Sunday—*Blessed be he that hath come and is to come* . . . —so giving the full account of His coming and correcting any idea that it is limited to the Sacrament.

The minister declares the intention to follow the command and example of Christ, setting apart the bread and wine that we may receive what He intends to give, giving thanks for what God has done for us in the Incarnation and Passion of His Son, and concluding with His words of institution. Here the people break in, associating themselves with what is being done.

To stress the fact that we *do this* in remembrance of Christ, there follows a

corporate act of recollection (*Anamnesis*) of the Cross, Resurrection and Ascension, expressing the belief that Jesus meant this act of obedience to be the means of His being present among His disciples.

After another interjection of praise, the minister prays that the Holy Spirit will sanctify the people and their gifts. This *Epiclesis* reminds us that the Sacrament is the act of the triune God; that the Revelation is completed by the gift of the Holy Spirit who has His part in the action.

In faith that God in Christ has reconciled them to Himself and that they have received the Spirit of adoption, the people bring the Eucharistic Prayer to its triumphant end with the Family Prayer of the redeemed.

No single moment of consecration is contemplated. The whole movement from Offertory to Communion is among a congregation prepared thereto by confession and the hearing of the Word.

After another time of silence, all join in the *Prayer of Humble Access*. The minister, as did Christ after giving thanks, breaks the bread in token of common sharing and for the purpose of distribution.

The elements are distributed with the words: *The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, the bread of life; The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, the true vine*. Other words may be used, and the method as is customary. The recommendation 'By Tables' stresses the family significance of the act. A suggestion that the wine be given by spoon is congenial to Indian sentiment and has no doctrinal significance.

After all have partaken, the minister calls the people to *Thanksgiving and Self-Offering*, at what the C.S.I. believes to be the proper place, i.e. not before but after the commemoration of the mighty acts of God in Christ and the receiving of His grace in the communion. The prayer includes the self-offering of the worshipper and his incorporation into the Body of Christ, enabling the people, as they praise God for what He has done for them in Christ, to offer themselves, in and through Christ, as a sacrifice acceptable to God, praying to know and to do His will.

Revelation 7₁₂ provides the final affirmation. The second Benediction is given. During a hymn, minister and helpers go out carrying alms, vessels, and Bible.

The revised Liturgy was approved by the Synod of 1954 for general use. As it rapidly wins its way in the C.S.I. it is proving to be not only the fruit, but the means of unity. And indubitably a means of Grace. In the long run it will be its own teacher and interpreter for, as Dr Ramsey has written, 'the supreme question is not what we make of the Eucharist but what the Eucharist is making of us as (together with the Word) it fashions us into the way of Christ'.⁵

MARCUS WARD

¹ *The Church of South India: The Lord's Supper or the Holy Eucharist*, 1954 Edition (1s. 3d.).

² Cf. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 7, pp.376ff.; also Vol. 4, pp.55ff., where a full account of the making and revision of the liturgy is given.

³ In what follows the movement of the service is outlined and a brief account given of points of particular interest. It will be useful to follow with a copy of the service. A full and valuable account is given in T. S. Garrett, *The Liturgy of the C.S.I.: Introduction and Commentary* (O.U.P., 1954).

⁴ *C.S.I. Bible Readings and Collects, for Sundays and other Special Days with Proper Prefaces* (O.U.P., 1954).

⁵ Michael Ramsey, *Durham Essays and Addresses*, p.21 (S.P.C.K., 1956).

THE CHRISTIAN BACKGROUND OF THE NETHERLANDS

WHEN I am asked to talk or write about the Netherlands, I always have the feeling that I want to begin by putting something right, and that is, that the Netherlands should not be altogether viewed in the light of the phrases by which they are known in this country, such as 'Dutch courage', 'talking double Dutch', etc. One could find quite a few more examples, but I want to mention just one other, because it is a fairly recent addition to the collection already in existence, and that is 'pious as a Dutchman'. I came across this expression (I still do not know whether it was meant as a compliment or not) in an English clergyman's report on his visit to the Netherlands. He had been so impressed by the long church services and the long grace at table before and after meals, that he felt he could speak of the 'pious Dutch'. (At this point I may perhaps be allowed to point out that Holland should be known as the Netherlands, Holland being only one of the provinces.)

With this we have reached our subject: the Christian background of the Netherlands. Roughly speaking, the little more than ten million people of the kingdom of the Netherlands can be subdivided into Protestants and Catholics, the Protestants being slightly in the majority. I need say little here about the Roman Catholic section of the people, because one may assume that they are, as a community or as a system, sufficiently well-known; this will leave me more room for the Protestant part, which I shall certainly need. The Netherlander is—and I do not believe that he is as yet known by that adjective in England—dogmatic by nature. Perhaps this gave rise to the quip: one Dutchman is a theologian, two form a church, and three bring about a schism. It almost seems as if this saying has become a true fact in Netherlands Protestantism. A few historic details will show this, and at the same time help us in our survey.

The Reformation in the Netherlands took place in the sixteenth century, for the same reasons as were found elsewhere: a yearning for the purifying of the Church of Rome, and for the separation of spiritual and political powers. These two motives went hand in hand, and the latter strongly fed the former; for the Reformation in the Netherlands was concurrent with the struggle for freedom against Spain, so that sometimes one hears it spoken of as the Revolutionary Reformation. The Revolutionaries sought to join with Calvin, a fact which, when we remember the conjunction of the two motives, is hardly to be wondered at. Luther, in his attitude to the State and in particular to royal authority, was too compliant. Calvin had, one could say, as his device: with God master in one's own house. Because of this, the more temperate reformers in the Netherlands (such as, for example, the very attractive and, through its purity beneficent movement of the Brethren of the Simple Life) were forced into the background. Similarly, the influence which the Renaissance had upon some (as, for instance, Erasmus) could not have its full spiritual effect, owing to the too great tolerance which it advocated; for tolerance, though it is perhaps one of the highest principles to which man can rise, can hardly be called suitable to bring about a Reformation, let alone inspire a fight for freedom.

The Reformation in the Netherlands was, therefore, fed spiritually by Calvin and the Church which was to come into being was a Calvinistic one. Her confession of faith was determined by that of Geneva, and her practical instruction

was found in the Heidelberg Catechism. One point which was to give rise to objection was the doctrine of Predestination, in which, certainly as interpreted in those days, there was no room for free will. When a group of Protestants delivered a protest (Remonstrance) in which they pleaded for a certain degree of free will on biblical grounds, they were cast out of the Church, and the Articles under which they and their opinions were sentenced became, with the Confession of Faith and the Catechism, the official creed of the Dutch Reformed Church. This first schism took place in 1618 at the Synod of Dordrecht, and established both the Reformed Church and the Remonstrant Brotherhood. The latter has, especially during recent years, sought alliance with the Congregational Churches in England and America. At about the same time as the Reformed Church was established, another group, albeit a very small one, formed itself as a religious society—i.e. the followers of Menno Simons. Simons, a former priest in the Roman Catholic Church, felt himself gripped by the ideas of the Sermon on the Mount, and this brought about in his own life and that of his congregation a purifying process on the lines laid down in that part of the New Testament. They formed a group which was based on obedience to Christ only, and they did not allow fighting, the taking of oaths, or infant baptism. Besides these negative principles, this small Church had the positive ideals of soberness, purity and community life, and to this day it occupies a high place amongst the Churches of the Netherlands.

The Golden Age brought splendour and greatness in many fields, but little change in Church matters. The Reformed Church was officially the State Church; but nevertheless it led a fairly disestablished existence, in which strict adherence to the Confession of Faith, or, in other words, dogmatical conservatism, took a leading place. It had come to a standstill, not really surprising after the hard-fought battles about Predestination and Free Will. It is therefore not to be wondered at that from time to time some groups were found which insisted upon a Revival, or, where Revivals had taken place, upon a return. One of these return groups seceded in the years 1834-5. Its members demanded a more complete obedience to the old Confession of Faith, and when this demand was not met and they had to suffer persecution (which would appear to be a weapon of all Christian Churches against minorities), they left the country and settled in America, where the Christian Reformed Church goes back to this secession. A yet stronger secession or return group followed in 1885 under the leadership of Dr A. Kuyper, who might be called the founder of the Gereformeerde Church (I have to leave this name as it is, for translated into English it would be 'Reformed'. To make it more clear, I sometimes call this fundamentalist-orientated Church the 're-Reformed Church'. This Church carried within itself the seeds of yet further schisms; two splits were to take place, and one is involuntarily inclined to subscribe to the opinion of a Roman Catholic scholar who said at the outbreak of the Reformation, that Protestantism was so divided within, that one could not glimpse any hope for it of a future unity.

The old Church of the Reformation, which in the middle of the last century became completely disestablished (the only thing which the Constitution says regarding the Throne is that the reigning monarchs shall be of the Protestant faith), gained new strength during the late war. Various groups in the Church which, because of their dogmatic differences, were wont to live without any

contact drew near to each other, and, thanks to the Reconstruction Movement with which the name of Professor Kraemer will always be connected, new life began and a fresh consciousness of the task of the Church. This led to a new Confession of Faith, and to a new liturgical approach to the services.

The services are like those held in all Presbyterian Churches, and are seen as the proclamation of the Word. Although in former years the part taken by the congregation was a very small one, now there is a possibility of the congregation joining more actively. The ordinary form of Presbyterian worship is sufficiently well-known and need not be described. A real difference from the Scottish or English Presbyterian Churches is found, however, in the Communion Service. This is celebrated in the Dutch Church in such a way that the service follows the pattern of the Last Supper of Christ and His disciples. The congregation is seated round a table, partaking with the minister, elders, and deacons of the bread and wine, which is handed round by one member to the other.

In Church government, there is one point on which no unity of thought has yet been reached, namely, the position of women. There are many supporters of the idea of women being ordained to the various ministries of the Church; but the strict adherents to the authority of the Scriptures, and particularly to that of St Paul, have not as yet permitted women to enter into the offices of minister, elder or deacon—in my opinion, to the detriment of both.

The divisions in religious matters have spread to all other spheres of the life of the people: to mention only three—politics, education, and the world of radio. The various Churches have brought about the setting up of political parties. In their excuse it may be advanced that they felt themselves forced to do this, partly by virtue of their principles, partly also by the fact that the Roman Catholic Church became a political power. There is a party to which many members of the old Reformed Church belong, the Christian Historical Union; then there is the Anti-Revolutionary Party, in which are united nearly all the members of the re-Reformed Church; next we find the Roman Catholic People's Party; and lastly, the very strong Labour Party, which now, together with the Roman Catholics, form the Government. Besides these four parties, there are still a number of smaller ones, although it is not so bad as it used to be before the war, when we had fifty-three parties who all sought representation in the Government. In the field of education we see the same divisions. In addition to the excellent State education, there are a number of special schools; these have the interest in particular of the re-Reformed and the Roman Catholics. Boarding-schools, such as we know them in England, are hardly ever found in the Netherlands. In the world of radio, we again have four parties, each one having its own transmission time. In this way it is possible at almost any hour of the day to listen to a religious service, if one is in the mood for it.

This individualism, so characteristic of the Netherlands people, may not place the nation in a favourable light. And yet it perhaps constitutes the strength of a people which, through this individualism, has made progress in nearly all fields, which has known how to emerge from the consequences of a war of destruction and which, small though it be, is still taking an active part in the life of the West European nations.

R. H. VAN APELDOORN

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ENTHUSIASM

A study in the origins of 'experimental theology'

II

IN the first part of this article we traced the influence upon John Wesley of the empiricist philosophy he had studied in the writings of Bishop Peter Browne. Our conclusions may now be illustrated from Wesley's language about Assurance, and indeed may shed some light on the obscurities in this doctrine.

I. THE TERM 'ASSURANCE'

The very term 'Assurance' probably owes something to the philosophers as well as to the Moravians.¹ It is at any rate interesting to find passages like the following in Locke:

It is true that the perception produced by demonstration is also very clear, yet it is often with a great abatement of that evident lustre and *full assurance*, that always accompany that which I call intuitive.²

Here Locke limits 'full assurance' to that certainty which attends sense perception. In this chapter on 'Enthusiasm' he criticizes the 'enthusiast':

The question here is, how do I know that God is the revealer of this to me; that this impression is made on my mind by his Holy Spirit, and that therefore I ought to obey it? If I know not this, how great soever the *assurance* is that I am possessed with, it is groundless; whatever light I pretend to, it is but enthusiasm.³

These passages are scattered, and I do not find the term 'assurance' in Peter Browne. But they indicate that *the* question exercising philosophers was, 'How can we be sure that our convictions are well grounded?'; and this is readily phrased as the problem of Assurance.

II. THE DIRECT AND THE INDIRECT WITNESS

One has more confidence in suggesting that Wesley's refinement of Moravian teaching in speaking of the Direct and the Indirect Witness owes something to the influence of Browne. It will be remembered that the Bishop of Cork distinguished three types of knowledge⁴—the direct evidence of sense-perception, the 'immediate feeling or consciousness of what is transacted in our mind' ('self-consciousness'), and 'mediate knowledge' derived from demonstration and argument. The first type is Wesley's 'Direct Witness' or the Witness of God's Spirit. The second and third types suggest to him the 'Witness of our own spirit'. The confusions arise largely because our knowledge of God in experience, however, like sense-perception, is in important respects different from the latter; these differences make the line between our 'sense' of an objective reality and our 'self-consciousness' difficult if not impossible to draw.

In the foregoing paragraph conclusions have been presented in an unqualified form for the sake of clarity. It is not suggested that Wesley went over his doctrine with a philosophical tooth-comb in one hand and a copy of Browne in the other. The following parallels, however, make it probable that Browne's teaching modified and moulded Wesley's exposition more than he realized or would have acknowledged.

We have tried to show that the Aldersgate experience met Wesley's demand

for an empirical knowledge of God and salvation analogous to that of sense-perception. What we must take to be his own considered definition in the sermon on 'The Witness of the Spirit' is as follows:

The testimony of the Spirit is an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God directly witnesses to my spirit, that I am a child of God.⁵

With this we compare Wesley's use of the metaphor of sealing, more frequent in the hymns, but also to be found in the sermons.⁶

Why was this metaphor so congenial? No doubt an important part of the answer is that Wesley considered it part of the traditional teaching of the Church. In the *Farther Appeal* he quotes from Athanasius a collocation of texts very similar to that on which he based his own doctrine of assurance,⁷ with the comment:

[Athanasius] joins the 'anointing of the Holy One', with that seal of the Spirit whereby all that persevere are 'sealed to the day of redemption'.

But we should also recall the words of Browne quoted earlier.⁸ In describing sense-perception, Browne describes the 'impression' made upon us by sensible objects as the same 'as when we apply the wax to the seal, or the seal to the wax'. A similar metaphor is frequently used by Locke.⁹

Honesty compels us to record the letter of 1781 in which Wesley says:

I do not insist on the term 'impression' . . . I will thank anyone who will find a better; be it 'discovery', 'manifestation', 'deep sense' or whatever it may be.¹⁰

However, the late date of this letter should be noted. Moreover, although in the sermon just quoted Wesley is uncertain of the adequacy of his definition ('desiring any who are taught of God to correct, to soften or strengthen the expression'), we are not limited to this passage or the language of 'sealing' for evidence that he regarded the direct knowledge of God granted in the experience of assurance as analogous to sense-perception.

While the hesitancy of Wesley's language both in the sermon and in the letter quoted above indicates his realization of the differences between religious experience and sense-perception, we do find faith frequently spoken of as a 'sense', and conversion as an opening of the 'spiritual senses'. Thus the *Minutes* of the 1744 Conference define justifying faith as—

a supernatural inward sense, or sight, of God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.¹¹

Similarly in the Sermons we find passages like the following:

but when he is born of God, born of the Spirit, how is the manner of his existence changed! His whole soul is now *sensible* of God, and he can say by sure experience, 'Thou art about my bed' . . .

The eyes of his understanding are now open, and he 'seeth him that is invisible' . . .

His ears are now opened, and the voice of God no longer calls in vain.

All his spiritual sense being now awakened he has a clear intercourse with the invisible world. . . .¹²

So far Wesley is speaking not as a philosopher. His language is the language of a saved sinner trying to hint at the experience which has overwhelmed him. The

interesting question for us, however, is whether Wesley elaborated the line of thought here adumbrated into a more philosophic apologetic for his faith. The naturalness of this step is indicated when we compare the contemporary development in moral philosophy.¹³ Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, like Wesley, were confronted with Locke's empiricism. Everything we know comes to us by way of sense. The most obvious escape from the complete scepticism of Hume in moral questions is to accept this epistemology, and then to postulate special internal 'senses' of beauty, morality, etc. This is what Hutcheson did, and Wesley was well aware of the development, even if he did not entirely see the point—his sympathies being alienated, one suspects, by Hutcheson's 'atheism':

Professor Hutcheson, late of Glasgow, places conscience in a different light. In his 'Essay on the Passions' he observes that we have several *senses*, or natural avenues of pleasure and pain, besides the five external senses. One of these he terms the public sense; whereby we are naturally pained at the misery of a fellow-creature. . . . And every man, says he, has a *moral sense*; whereby he approves of benevolence and disapproves of cruelty. . . .

All this is, in some sense, undoubtedly true. But it is not true, that either the public or the moral sense . . . is now natural to man.¹⁴

It is Wesley's qualified approval of Hutcheson's idea of internal senses that we notice. It is in line with his own empiricism.

But while it is true that Wesley never took time to expound his thinking philosophically in print, or to attempt a full answer to the Deists, the general opinion that he did not seriously attempt 'to indicate the relationship of his doctrine of Assurance to this trend of philosophy'¹⁵ seems to need some qualification. *The Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, published in the same year as the *Minutes* of the first Conference quoted above, outlines, though briefly, what is almost a doctrine of a 'Religious Sense' akin to the Moral Sense of the philosophers. The word 'almost' is important. Wesley strenuously denied (what Hutcheson asserted of the Moral Sense) that it was a natural capacity of man in his fallen state.¹⁶ But this is the theologian's doctrine. The philosopher is aware only of an experience given through some kind of sense. This experience is that datum on which the theologian must work. In the language of Peter Browne, ideas of sense are 'subjects for the farther employment of our understanding and will; for observation and judgement; for all our inferences and discourses and reasonings.'¹⁷ How close this is to Wesley's analysis, which is brief enough to be quoted fairly fully:

We therefore not only allow, but earnestly exhort, all who seek after true religion, to use all the reason¹⁸ which God hath given them, in searching out the things of God. But your reasoning justly, not only on this, but on any subject whatsoever, pre-supposes true judgements already formed, whereon to ground your argumentation. Else, you know, you will stumble at every step. . . .

You know, likewise, that before it is possible for you to form a true judgement of them, it is absolutely necessary that you have a clear apprehension of the things of God and that your ideas thereof be all fixed, distinct, determinate. And seeing our ideas are not innate but must originally come from our senses, it is certainly necessary that you have senses capable of discerning objects of this kind: Not only those that are called natural senses, which in this respect profit nothing, as being altogether incapable of discerning objects of a spiritual kind; but spiritual senses, exercised to

discern spiritual good and evil. It is necessary that you have *the hearing ear*, and *the seeing eye*, emphatically so called; that you have a new class of senses opened in your soul, not depending on organs of flesh and blood to be the evidence of things not seen, as your bodily senses are of visible things; to be the avenues to the invisible world, to discern spiritual objects, and to furnish you with ideas of what the outward eye hath not seen, neither the ear heard.¹⁹

Wesley's tendency to label such a spiritual sense, which is the gift of God, 'faith', and his consequent confusion between justifying faith and assurance will be discussed below.²⁰ For the moment we note that Wesley in passages like this shows how readily his experience was fitted into the scheme of empiricist epistemology we have analysed. His words suggest that he was prepared to rely on the evidence of this Spiritual Sense, not only for the knowledge that his sin was forgiven, but for his whole defence against Deists and atheists. For him the appeal to experience was the supreme apologetic for the Christian faith, for in this way the philosophical demand for empiricism appeared firmly met.

In 1748 Wesley published a *Letter to the Rev. Dr Middleton*, who in his *Free Enquiry* had challenged the evidence for miracles in the early centuries of Christian history. Wesley energetically defends the tradition, and rounds off his reply with a statement of his own faith. He adds the following comments on the traditional arguments for Christianity:

Traditional evidence is of an extremely complicated nature, necessarily including so many and so various considerations, that only men of a strong and clear understanding can be sensible of its full force. On the contrary, how plain and simple is this: and how level to the lowest capacity! Is not this the sum: 'One thing I know; I was blind, but now I see'? An argument so plain, that a peasant, a woman, a child, may feel its force. . . .

If then it were possible (which I conceive it is not) to shake the traditional evidence of Christianity, still he that has the internal evidence (and every true believer hath the witness or evidence in himself) would stand firm and unshaken. Still he could say to those who were striking at the external evidence, "Beat on the sack of Anaxagoras." But you can no more hurt my evidence of Christianity, than the tyrant could hurt the spirit of that wise man.²¹

As Dr Bett comments, the anticipation of Schleiermacher in passages like this (and even more in subsequent paragraphs of the same letter) is remarkable.²² It was perhaps Wesley's religious awareness of the unique and almost ineffable quality (at least in philosophic terms) of his experience of the grace of God that prevented his working out the doctrine of a special Religious Sense. But our quotations have shown that he was working within the scheme laid down for him by Locke and Browne. His claim to direct knowledge of God was precisely 'enthusiasm' in the sense Locke had defined it, and in this sense he was always unwilling to repudiate it.²³

His position is clear from the opening sections of Sermon XXXII, 'The Nature of Enthusiasm'. The tests for true, as against false, enthusiasm which follow in this sermon are all outward marks, corresponding to that Indirect Witness which for Wesley corroborated the Direct Witness. But as for the experience of assurance itself, Wesley never met the philosopher's demand for criteria. Indeed he denied that it could be met:

To require a more minute and philosophical account of the manner whereby we

distinguish these, and of the criteria, or intrinsic marks, whereby we know the voice of God, is to make a demand which can never be answered: no, not by one who has the deepest knowledge of God.²⁴

He did however believe that the conditions laid down by Browne for direct knowledge of the reality of spirit had been fulfilled, despite Browne's strenuous denial that this was possible:

Purely 'Intellectual Spiritual Ideas' must come to us in one of three ways:

1. By the presence of the object and an immediate impression of it on some faculty of the mind . . .

2. . . . from the immediate power of God who may according to this opinion impregnate the mind with true and direct ideas of spiritual things. . . .²⁵

We turn from the Direct to the Indirect Witness. And here we must recall Browne's other two avenues of knowledge: self-consciousness and mediate knowledge. Browne's definition of the former quoted in the first part of this paper is very reminiscent of Wesley's language about the Indirect Witness. Browne claims,

We have a knowledge of all the faculties of powers and operations of the soul, not only those of the intellect and will, but of all the passions likewise and affections of the inferior soul. This kind of perception some have not unaptly called internal sensation.²⁶

'The necessary assent of the mind doth not only follow of course upon this consciousness, as it is in the case of external sensation, but falls in with it: they are so closely connected that the consciousness is itself the immediate act of assent of knowledge. . . . It is so sure and obvious, so clear and distinct that it admits of no proof or farther evidence from reason.'²⁷

Thus far Browne. We turn to Wesley:

And first as to the witness of our spirit: the soul as intimately and evidently perceives when it loves, delights, and rejoices in God, as when it loves and delights in anything on earth.²⁸

God has made us thinking beings, capable of perceiving what is present, and of reflecting or looking back on what is past. In particular, we are capable of perceiving whatsoever passes in our own hearts or lives; of knowing whatsoever we feel or do; and that either while it passes or when it is past. This we mean when we say, man is a conscious being: he hath a consciousness, or inward perception, both of things present and past, relating to himself, of his own tempers, and outward behaviour.²⁹

I rejoice, because I both see and feel, through the inspiration of God's Holy Spirit, that all my works are wrought in Him, yea, and that it is he who worketh all my works in me. I rejoice in seeing through the light of God, which shines in my heart, that I have power to walk in His ways; and that, through His grace, I turn not therefrom to the right hand or the left.³⁰

As the context shows, it is the consciousness of inward joy which is important here, and which constitutes the witness of our own spirit. A man is conscious of the effects of the working of the Holy Spirit in his heart, and this 'self-consciousness' may be described as the witness of his own spirit, which perceives internal sensations in the way Browne describes. As for Browne the 'immediate self-consciousness' of passions such as remorse or a good conscience is 'solid ground of evidence for the essential and eternal difference between virtue and vice',³¹ so for Wesley the inward perception of the graces

wrought by the Holy Spirit is a divine *elenchos* of the fact of salvation.

One is tempted to suggest, therefore, this reason for Wesley's formulation of the doctrine of the conjoint witness which has proved such an embarrassment for his expositors. In Browne he had discovered two ways of immediate knowledge—sense-perception and 'self-consciousness' (or 'internal sensation'). Now whether or not the second of these implies an unacknowledged retraction of Browne's advertised empiricism, there is a perfectly clear distinction here. Wesley, as we have seen, was tempted to carry Browne's empiricism into the religious sphere: knowledge of God's saving grace is like sense-perception, in which an external reality (the Holy Spirit) impresses itself on our mind. This is the Direct Witness of God's Spirit. But a close analysis by introspection shows that this experience is something internal, known by 'internal sensation', which is entirely analogous to Browne's 'self-consciousness'. Hence there is added to the Direct Witness, the Witness of Our Own Spirit. The trouble arises from the fact that while Browne's distinction between perceiving external objects and being aware of the internal motions of the soul is perfectly clear, there is no such clear distinction in religious experience between the objective source of illumination and the subjective perception of that illumination. In so far, therefore, as Wesley intended by 'the Witness of Our Own Spirit' an immediate consciousness of God's working in the heart, we must conclude that it is *empirically* indistinguishable from what Wesley describes as the Witness of God's Spirit.

Two points are to be noted. In the first place, this conclusion does not at all preclude the theologian from saying that this experience has its source in the grace of God, which is entirely objective; though he will be extremely chary in attempting to guard this objectivity by suggesting that religious experience is analogous to sense-perception.

In the second place, our criticism does not apply to that other aspect of Wesley's doctrine of the Indirect Witness which assimilates it to Browne's 'mediate knowledge'. One would like to tidy up Wesley's extremely loose use of terms, and call that 'self-consciousness' we have just examined 'the Witness of Our Own Spirit', and reserve the term 'the Indirect Witness' for that series of arguments from the outward life and experience (both of oneself and others), and from scripture, which Wesley relies on to provide corroboration of the 'Direct Witness'. Wesley does not clarify his position in this way. Nevertheless, a fairly clear distinction can be drawn between passages where an immediate self-consciousness is in view and those where other tests are counted as a part of the Witness of Our Own Spirit. To these latter we now turn.

The Bishop of Cork had devoted considerable space in his treatise to the methods whereby we come by 'mediate knowledge'—deductions from the data supplied by sense. The pattern of his argument with reference to our knowledge of God, for example, is summarized in the following passage:

We observe such effects with regard to things material and sensible as we conclude cannot proceed from any inherent power in themselves; and therefore we rightly infer there must be some other beings *not material* which have the power of producing such effects; though such beings are utterly imperceptible to us, and we have no idea of them properly speaking. So that we come to our knowledge of power, not from any *direct knowledge* or idea we have of spirit, but entirely from our reasoning upon sensible objects.³²

In Book II, chapter vi, Browne distinguishes four types of argumentation from the data of sense: (1) science or demonstration, especially through the syllogism; (2) moral certainty (e.g. our full acceptance in faith of the truths of religion, though they go beyond mathematical demonstration); (3) opinion; (4) the testimony of others. Each of these except the third manifestly occurs in Wesley's exposition of the indirect witness. But they are of such an obvious nature that to say that Browne influenced Wesley here is almost to suggest that the latter was incapable of thinking for himself. Little is to be gained by attempting to systematize Wesley's thought under these headings. We might for example say that for Wesley the authority of scripture is a matter of 'moral certainty'. This belief, coupled with the data of experience furnished the premisses for many 'demonstrations' (of Browne's first type) through the syllogism, and such syllogisms abound in Wesley's writing, not least in his treatment of Assurance.³³ Furthermore, as all students of Wesley have emphasized, Methodism was not founded upon the experience of Wesley alone. Perhaps in conscious obedience to the principles of Bacon's *Novum Organum*, as Eayrs suggests, Wesley most carefully collated the experiences of others, and regarded it as experimental evidence in confirmation of his own faith.³⁴ Wesley was well aware of the dangers of individual inspiration, as the Sermon 'On the Nature of Enthusiasm' well shows. But while these objective tests of appeal to the fruit of good living, the scripture, and the experience of others, are of great importance for a full exposition of Wesley's doctrine of Assurance, they do not shed much light on our central question, the interpretation of that central experience on which the whole hinges. We must be content with this bare summary, and pass to certain modifications and retractions in the later writings which suggest that our scheme has been too simple and clear-cut to represent the complexities (or confusions) of Wesley's thought.

III. CONFUSIONS

(a) *On 'Direct' Knowledge of God.* It has been suggested above that Wesley's doctrine of the Direct Witness approximated to the idea of a spiritual sense (though he did not work out this doctrine in a philosophically rigorous manner). Indeed, in his claim to have direct knowledge of spiritual things, he must rank as an 'enthusiast' in the strictly limited definition of John Locke. This view is confirmed by his admiration for the Montanists,³⁵ and the fact that at a very much later period he could write in his *Journal*:

The very thing Mr. Shinsra calls Fanaticism is no other than heart-religion; in other words, righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. These must be *felt*, or they have no being.³⁶

But while the language we have used about a spiritual sense analogous to sense-perception must stand, for it is required by the passages quoted, it raises very great difficulties. The difficulties are discussed at large in the *Letters to John Smith*, in connexion with the question whether and in what sense Wesley held a doctrine of 'perceptible inspiration'. Wesley holds to the term,³⁷ but it is hard to acquit him of the charge brought against him by his correspondent of 'distinguishing it away'.³⁸

The problem may be thus formulated. Two answers are given to the question,

'How do we know God's forgiveness in the experience of assurance?' (1) We are directly aware of the Holy Spirit, in that He makes an impression (as do objects of sense) upon the heart. (2) We are inwardly conscious of feelings of joy, peace, etc., which are evidence of the Holy Spirit's working. The difference may be expressed by saying that in the first case we are aware of God forgiving us, and in the second we are aware *that* He has forgiven us. We have already pointed out the complete unreality of this distinction in the moment of experience. Unfortunately, we must insist on it, because Wesley's separation between the Witness of God's Spirit and the Witness of Our Own Spirit can only stand if by the Direct Witness he means the direct awareness of our first formulation.

It seems fairly clear that the interpretation we have given of the Direct Witness suggested the charge that Wesley preached 'perceptible inspiration'. This was Quaker doctrine, and led to a good deal of irrational and foolish action under the impetus of supposed guidance. These extremes Wesley constantly repudiated, but maintained the doctrine in the matter of saving faith. Did he give it, however, more than verbal support? The *Letters to John Smith* and the *Farther Appeal* show that Wesley was unwilling to face the implications of his rather unguarded language in Sermon X and the *Earnest Appeal*—nor indeed shall we blame him for this. By 'perceptible inspiration' Wesley means—

that inspiration of God's Holy Spirit, whereby he fills us with righteousness, peace, and joy, with love to Him and to all mankind. And we believe it cannot be, in the nature of things, that a man should be filled with this peace, and joy and love, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit without perceiving it as clearly as he does the light of the sun.³⁹

This is the language of the second formula, and is exactly what is elsewhere described as the Witness of Our Own Spirit. The direct knowledge of God's Spirit is repudiated in a passage like the following (from the *Farther Appeal*) which might have been written by Peter Browne himself. Quoting a critic who declared: 'That the Scriptures declare the operations of the Spirit are not subject to any sensible feelings,' Wesley replies:

You are here disproving, as you suppose, a proposition of mine. But are you sure you understand it? By feeling, I mean being inwardly conscious of. By the operations of the Spirit, I do not mean the manner in which He operates, but the graces which he operates in a Christian. Now be pleased to produce those scriptures which declare that a Christian cannot feel or perceive these operations.⁴⁰

The passage is referred to by Wesley for the enlightenment of John Smith,⁴¹ and the explanation must be accepted. We must confess, however, that the critics have our sympathy. We too have been misled. Furthermore, we are inclined to suggest that the course of Wesley's thinking was much as we have outlined it. His empiricism did lead him to speak incautiously about the Direct Witness, in the light of the Aldersgate experience, as though he perceived the spiritual world very much as he perceived the natural world. The objections raised against perceptible inspiration caused him to modify his view into something much more orthodox from a philosophical point of view. If, however, the modification be accepted, the notion that we can distinguish *in experience* the Direct from the Indirect Witness must go by the board. Originally Wesley

appeared to be describing two facts of experience, standing in the same relationship to the man who experiences them: experience A, which is the Witness of God's Spirit, plus experience B, which is the Witness of Our Own Spirit. A and B are then analogous to seeing a rose (experience A) and delighting in the beauty of the rose (experience B). The explanations in the *Farther Appeal* and the *Letters to John Smith* show that Wesley only wishes to claim one type of experience, viz. consciousness of the graces which the Holy Spirit works in the heart. (That this experience is confirmed as valid by the objective tests which form another part of Wesley's Indirect Witness is for the moment irrelevant.) This experience is inwardly perceived by a man, and this inward perception is the Witness of His Own Spirit. But although there is nothing else to perceive in experience alongside these graces of joy, peace, etc., the *theologian* will claim that these graces are the direct work of the Holy Spirit. In this sense, these *same* experiences may be looked upon as the Witness of God's Spirit. It is only some such analysis that can make sense of a passage like the following:

But you thought I had meant 'immediate inspiration'. So I do, or I mean nothing at all. Not indeed such inspiration as is *sine mediis*. But all inspiration, though by means, is *immediate*. Suppose, for instance you are employed in private prayer, and God pours his love into your heart. God then acts *immediately* on your soul; and the love of him which you then experience, is as *immediately* breathed into you by the Holy Ghost, as if you had lived seventeen hundred years ago. Change the term: Say, God then assists you to love him. Well, and is not this *immediate assistance*? Say, His Spirit concurs with yours. You gain no ground. It is *immediate concurrence*, or none at all. God, a spirit, acts upon your spirit. Make it out any otherwise if you can.⁴²

The argument may be put formally by saying that in the original exposition, the Direct and the Indirect Witness appeared to be expressions of the same logical type, but in the explanations of his meaning, Wesley shows that they are of different logical types: the Indirect Witness, or Witness of Our Own Spirit, is a name for an experience, whereas the Direct Witness, or Witness of God's Spirit, is the theologian's reflection upon or inference from experience. I think we must agree with John Smith that perceptible inspiration has been 'distinguished away'.⁴³ On the other hand, we must not lose sight of the enormous importance (revolutionary for its time) of Wesley's insistence on the appeal to experience as evidence of the working of God's Spirit. It was this which he thought he was defending in the term 'perceptible inspiration.'

(b) *On Saving Faith and Assurance*. Wesley's notoriously ambiguous language has given only too much ground for the accusation that he spoke of the faith which justifies as an experience. This subject demands an essay in itself to discuss the fluctuations and final clarification of Wesley's thought.⁴⁴ But our enquiry sheds some light on the cause of this confusion, and the topic is too germane to be omitted here, although it must be dealt with summarily.

The key verse which for Wesley constitutes a definition of faith, and to which he reverts again and again,⁴⁵ is Hebrews 11₁:

Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

We first notice the popularity of this verse in eighteenth-century thought. We may take Browne, whom we have already quoted at length,⁴⁶ as a typical exponent. The same account of faith, though without the biblical reference, is

to be found in John Locke.⁴⁷ Hebrews 11, has a philosophical cast peculiarly in tune with eighteenth-century rationalism, and suggests at once that the definition of faith which these philosophers could accept was the one which the Bible offered: faith is primarily the attitude of mind which believes truths about an unseen spiritual world which reason is unable to discover, but which satisfies the demands of reason for evidence. To be fair to Browne, he did point out that saving faith was more than rational assent, but it was the yielding of the whole personality to the truths accepted by reason, not a relationship to Christ, still less an experience, or a response to an experience:

Thus we see that men must know, before they can rightly believe; and have a full conviction of their judgement upon sufficient evidence, before there is any closing of the will to complete the nature of evangelical faith; which is literally as the apostle defines it, the evidence of things not seen or the assent of the understanding to the truth and existence of things inconceivable upon certain and evident proof of their reality in their symbols and representatives.⁴⁸

The primary question is still epistemological. Faith is the Christian's answer to the epistemological problem (see Heb. 11), and this definition of faith was uncritically supposed to be identical with that 'faith' which plays so large a part in Paul's theology.

Now Wesley's answer to the epistemological problem was the appeal to experience. His experience were often referred to, with reference to this verse of Hebrews, as a divine *elenchos*. Even without assistance from the confusion in Moravian thinking on this point (which of course played an important part in the formation of his views), Wesley would only have been following the pattern of the age in identifying his answer to the epistemological problem (i.e. *pistis* in Heb. 11) with saving evangelical faith (the genuinely Pauline *pistis*). Before modern critical discussion of the New Testament, the doubts of Origen about the authenticity of Hebrews were disregarded, and in his *Notes on the New Testament* Wesley states of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that 'Paul's method and style are easily observed therein.' It seemed, therefore, that the Apostle identified 'faith' with a divine *elenchos*.⁴⁹ The conclusion seemed to follow that if the divine *elenchos* was to be found in experience, then faith must be an experience—or at least true faith would never occur unless it was accompanied by an experience.

The identification was made all the more irresistible to Wesley by the fact that the experience which had solved his philosophical worries about the truth of the Christian revelation by giving him solid evidence of the reality of an unseen world was itself an experience of the divine forgiveness which set the seal upon his intellectual acceptance of Böhler's doctrine of salvation by faith alone.

I do not wish to underestimate the importance of the Moravians in this connexion. The relation between saving faith and assurance was much discussed among them.⁵⁰ But the climate of thought I have outlined, which dominated the English philosophical theologians, must be admitted to have made a notable contribution to the confusion. Fortunately Wesley eventually clarified the issue, and the charge that he taught that faith is an emotion will not stand.⁵¹ But initially he was tempted to do so, and not a few incautious passages seem to bear this interpretation.

CONCLUSION

This article has confined itself within very narrow limits, attempting to trace the way in which the general temper of the age in which Wesley lived dominated his thought. We have concentrated on what I would claim is the dominant philosophical influence: that of British empiricism, initiated by Locke, and mediated to Wesley through the writings of Peter Browne. Of course the pattern was much more complex than is here represented. This was but part of that whole movement away from authoritarian scholasticism initiated by Descartes, and developed in England by the Cambridge Platonists, which is described by Basil Willey's *Seventeenth-century Background*. But as far as Wesley is concerned, Descartes is very much in the background,⁵² and references to his influence upon Wesley seem to rest on a misinterpretation of the 'cogito'.⁵³ More important, perhaps, were the Cambridge Platonists, who seem to have influenced Locke,⁵⁴ and whom Wesley quotes from time to time. Their championing of reason is certainly reflected in Wesley's defence against the charge of irrational enthusiasm. But reason for Wesley is much more the analytic faculty of the mind applied to experience, than a luminous source of truth, as the Platonists conceived of it, and this change in the use of the term reflects again the dominating influence of philosophical empiricism.

In conclusion, we would point out, positively, that the claim that Wesley anticipated Schleiermacher in point of theological method is confirmed. The two thinkers had this at least in common, that both were influenced by Moravian pietism, and both concluded that a living theology must be founded on experience. The difference between Wesley and the founder of theological Liberalism lay in the type of experience to which each appealed. The 'if' method of writing history is notoriously futile, but one may be permitted to wonder what course nineteenth-century theology would have taken if Wesley rather than Schleiermacher had given shape to a theology of experience, based not upon the ill-starred 'feeling of absolute dependence', but upon the authentic evangelical experience.

It must however be admitted that, as it stands, Wesley's teaching is decidedly unsatisfactory. His tentative advances and withdrawals in the borderland of a Religious Sense suggest that while experience (of some kind) is essential, the analogy with sense-perception is bound to mislead. Moreover, his theory of the conjoint witness, if it is to stand for two elements which are distinguishable in experience, must be abandoned. As we have seen, Wesley failed to see that he was presenting as two experiences what were really two ways of looking at the same experience.

Nevertheless, we should, I believe, value Wesley's appeal to experience as (among other things) an essentially right way of re-orientating theology in the face of philosophical empiricism; and we should view his discussion of perceptible inspiration and kindred topics as a brave first attempt to plot a course through the problems raised (and the solutions offered) by a consideration of religious experience in the no-man's-land of philosophical theology.

J. CLIFFORD HINDLEY

¹ For Moravian influence, cf. the conversations with Christian David, *Journal*, II.28ff., especially 35f. Letter to Charles Wesley of 28th June 1738, *Letters* I.248; Yates, *The Doctrine of Assurance*, Part I, Chaps. III-IV.

² *Essay*, IV, ii, 6; cf. IV, xviii, 4.

³ *Essay*, IV, xix, 10; cf. xix, 1.

⁴ Part I of this article, *LQR*, April 1957.

⁵ Sermon X, i, 7. Sermon references are to the numbering in the popular edition of *Forty-four Sermons*, Epworth, 1944.

⁶ E.g. Sermon XIV, ii, 4.

⁷ *Works*, VIII, p.99.

⁸ Part I, *LQR*, April 1957.

⁹ Locke, *Essay*, I, iii, 6, 14, iv, 6, 12. That the references here are to Locke's *bêtes noires*—innate ideas—does not affect the argument.

¹⁰ Yates, op. cit., p.73.

¹¹ Simon, J. W. and the *Methodist Societies*, p.207.

¹² Sermon XV, i, 8-10.

¹³ For what follows see the detailed argument of D. D. Raphael, *The Moral Sense* (Oxford, 1947).

¹⁴ Sermon CV, 'On Conscience', *Works*, VII.186f.

¹⁵ Yates, op. cit., p.214; cf. Bett *The Spirit of Methodism*, p.141.

¹⁶ *Earnest Appeal*, para. 10ff.

¹⁷ Op. cit., p.176.

¹⁸ The passage quoted follows a eulogy of reason which reflects decidedly non-empiricist influences.

¹⁹ *Earnest Appeal*, paras. 31f. (*Works*, VIII.13); cf. paras. 6-7.

²⁰ Section III (b).

²¹ *Works*, X.75ff. I owe this reference to Bett, *The Spirit of Methodism*, pp.136f.

²² Op. cit., p.144.

²³ It is arguable, however, that he 'distinguished it away'. See below.

²⁴ Sermon X, ii, 10.

²⁵ Browne's *Essay*, pp.92f. Wesley's Abridgement, pp.xx-xxi. See Part I.

²⁶ B., p.222; W., p.xl.

²⁷ Browne, p.224.

²⁸ Sermon X, i, 11.

²⁹ Sermon XI, 4.

³⁰ Sermon XI, 16.

³¹ Browne, p.227.

³² Browne, op. cit., p.74. Wesley's abridgement, p.xv.

³³ Sermon X, i, 4. Compare the appeal to the Bible in Sermon XI. Knox (*Enthusiasm*, p.454) is perhaps justified in commenting: 'It is always to Wesley's interpretation of Scripture that Wesley appeals.' Compare R. E. Davies's conclusion about Luther—*The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers*, pp.56f.

³⁴ Compare Wesley's appeal to the evidence of 12,000 or 13,000 persons 'who have severally testified to me with their own mouths that they do know the day when the love of God was first shed abroad in their hearts', *Letters to John Smith*, XXXVIII (*Works*, XII.61). (The huge figure of 13,000 is corrected to 1,300 in the next letter.)

³⁵ Compare the quotation in Knox, op. cit., p.451.

³⁶ *Journal*, V.426, 12th August 1771. Quoted Knox, op. cit., p.537.

³⁷ 'For this I earnestly contend', *Letters to John Smith*, XXXIX (*Works*, XII.70).

³⁸ Letter XLI, *Works*, XII.84.

³⁹ *Works*, XII.70.

⁴⁰ *Works*, VIII.78.

⁴¹ *Works*, XII.78.

⁴² *Farther Appeal* (*Works*, VIII.107). The position as modified is to be found (at least verbally) in Peter Browne: 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God: that is the miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit immediately upon the purely spiritual and rational part of us, and so endowing us with knowledge and the gift of tongues, is an undoubted full conviction of our adoption. Again, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit; because the secret influences of the Holy Spirit in the work of grace are directly and immediately upon our spirit' (op. cit., p.354).

⁴³ It is interesting to compare the essentially similar, though far more elaborate and detailed discussions of the problem here adumbrated in F. R. Tennant, *Philosophical Theology*, Vol. I, Chap. XII, and the essay 'A Religious Way of Knowing', by C. B. Martin, in *New Essays in Philosophical Theology* (ed. Flew and MacIntyre).

⁴⁴ Wesley's development is fully discussed in Yates, op. cit., Part II, Chap. II.

⁴⁵ E.g. *Sermons*, IV, i, 2, XI, 8, IX, iii, 3, XIII, i, 7; XXXII, 3. The 1744 *Minutes. Earnest Appeal*, para. 49. *Farther Appeal*, para. 4, etc.

⁴⁶ Part I, *LQR*, April 1957.

⁴⁷ *Essay*, IV, xvi.

⁴⁸ Browne, op. cit., p.250. Wesley's abridgement, pp. xlviii-xlix.

⁴⁹ Wesley's note on Hebrews 11, displays some uneasiness about the identification of *pistis* in this verse with justifying faith. But the whole chapter is said to give 'evidences of the power of justifying faith in Christ'.

⁵⁰ Yates, op. cit., pp.32ff.

⁵¹ Wesley's development is fully discussed in Yates, Part II, Chap. II.

⁵² Descartes is not referred to in the index of *Works, Journal or Letters*, nor in the list of philosophers mentioned as used by Wesley in Eayrs, *Wesley, Philosopher and Church Founder*, p.53. Both Dimond (*The Psychology of the Methodist Revival*, p.232) and Yates (op. cit., pp.67, 213f.) seem to think him important.

⁵³ Cf. F. R. Tennant, *Philosophical Theology*, I.13.

⁵⁴ Cf. F. J. Powicke, *The Cambridge Platonists*, pp.199-202. Wesley quotes the favourite text of the Platonists, that reason is the 'candle of the Lord', in Sermon LXX, 'On Reason'.

PRIESTHOOD AND MINISTRY

Part I

IN the second chapter of the First Epistle of Peter the Christian Church is described as a holy and a royal priesthood, whose function it is to offer spiritual sacrifices to God through Jesus Christ, and to make known to the world His wonderful deeds (1 Pet. 2_{5,9}). In the fifth chapter of the same Epistle mention is made of elders (or presbyters) in the Church, whose task it is, as under-shepherds in the service of the Chief Shepherd, Christ, to tend the flock of God that is in their charge; and they are exhorted to fulfil this task in the spirit of Christ, not domineering over the flock, but being examples to it (1 Pet. 5_{1ff.}). These two passages bring before us the ideas of priesthood and ministry to which the title of this paper refers: the universal priesthood of all believers, and the pastoral ministry to which some members of the universal priesthood are ordained.

There has been a good deal of confusion in the course of Christian history as to the precise significance of these ideas, and therefore as to the relation between them; and there is not a little confusion still today. In some communions the ordained Ministry is known as the priesthood, and is credited with priestly powers and functions which other Christians do not share. A sharp distinction is drawn between the priest and the layman, and the idea of the universal priesthood, if not entirely ignored, is allowed to play only a limited and very subordinate role. In other communions, where the identification of priesthood and ordained Ministry is repudiated as 'sacerdotalism', the idea of the universal priesthood is by no means always adequately maintained, and sometimes a quite improper use is made of it. It is sometimes argued, for example, that because all Christians are priests, any Christian layman has as much right as any ordained minister to administer the sacraments. This argument itself, however, can hardly escape the charge of sacerdotalism; for while it undoubtedly excludes the sacerdotal idea that ordination invests the minister with a priestly character, it accepts quite uncritically the sacerdotal assumption that a priestly character is what qualifies a man to act as a minister. What is more, it almost inevitably robs ordination of its true significance, and opens the way for that degraded, secular view of the Ministry, which regards it as nothing more than a full-time paid employment in an ecclesiastical organization.

But let us return to St Peter's description of the Church as a holy and royal priesthood—which is paralleled, we may note, in the Book of Revelation, where Christians are called a kingdom and priests unto God, priests of God and of Christ (Rev. 1₆, 5₁₀, 20₆). In using these descriptions, both St Peter and the author of Revelation have in mind a passage from the Book of Exodus, in which a promise is given to ancient Israel that it shall be 'a kingdom of priests and an holy nation' (Exod. 19₆). They are following a custom that is very common in the New Testament, of ascribing to the Christian Church titles and prerogatives that are ascribed in the Old Testament to Israel. There is nothing strange in this, if we remember that, as the New Testament writers see it, there is a direct and unbroken continuity between Israel and the Church. Israel is the People of God under the Old Covenant, and the Church is the same People under the New Covenant. For Israel, in the New Testament understanding of the term, is not 'Israel after the flesh' (1 Cor. 10₁₈), or those who are merely physically descended from Abraham (Rom. 11_{6ff.}). Even under the Old Covenant, the true People of God are rather those who share the faith of Abraham, and who

are thus his spiritual descendants (Rom. 4_{11ff.}; Gal. 2_{7ff.}). Under the New Covenant, therefore, Israel, as the People of God, has not been superseded or displaced, but has begun to see the fulfilment of God's promises to it under the Old—one aspect of which is the incorporation of believing Gentiles into the 'commonwealth of Israel' (Rom. 10₁₂, 11₁₇; Eph. 2_{12ff.}, 19_{ff.}). It is therefore not surprising that the Church can be called 'the Israel of God' (Gal. 6₁₆), or that Christians can be called 'an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession' (1 Pet. 2₉).

Israel, under both the Old and the New Covenant, is an 'elect race' and a 'people for God's own possession', inasmuch as it has been selected out of all the peoples of the earth to be at once the recipient and the instrument of God's saving purpose. It is a people set apart and dedicated to God, and therefore a 'holy nation'; and because it has been set apart and dedicated for special service to God and man, it is a 'kingdom of priests'. That at any rate is what Israel is intended to be; that is the purpose of its 'election', and that is what God promised it should be, when through Moses he established the Old Covenant (Exod. 19_{5ff.}). But the purpose of Israel's election was not all at once fulfilled. The nation as a whole failed to keep the Covenant, and the realization of its promised destiny as a kingdom of priests long remained only a hope (cf. Isa. 61₆). It remained, indeed, a hope until, in the fullness of the time, God instituted the New Covenant through Christ, in whom all the Divine promises find their fulfilment (2 Cor. 1₂₀). It is on the ground of the New Covenant, therefore, that St Peter and the author of Revelation base their affirmation of the priesthood of all believers, as we shall see.

So long, however, as the Old Covenant remained in force, there was in Israel a special priesthood, an order of persons specially set apart for priestly service. The origin and development of this order was no doubt much less simple and straightforward than the dominant Old Testament tradition suggests;¹ but into that question we need not enter here. The fact remains that the Levitical priesthood existed, that it was believed (perhaps rightly) to have been established at the time of the Covenant at Sinai (Exod. 28₁, 29_{1ff.}), and that membership of it became eventually, if it was not originally, hereditary and restricted to certain priestly families. Those consecrated to this priesthood in earlier times, carried out their duties chiefly at holy places of public worship, of which they were the guardians, though they could also act as private chaplains at domestic shrines (Judges 17₁₀, 18₁₉). But when in due course the religious institutions of Israel were centralized in the Temple at Jerusalem, the priesthood also was naturally gathered there, and its different ranks and orders fulfilled their various offices under the supreme direction of the High Priest.

The essential functions of the priesthood are succinctly described in the Book of Deuteronomy, where it is said: 'They shall teach Jacob thy judgements, and Israel thy law: they shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt offering upon thine altar' (Deut. 33₁₀). The task of the priest was thus twofold: he had to speak to men in the name of God, teaching them the Divine will, and to approach God on behalf of men, presenting their offerings and sacrifices to Him. The priest was a mediator between God and man.

There seems, however, to be no doubt that in early times the primary function of the priest was to teach. It was his business to speak God's word and declare

His will to men, whether by delivering an oracle, casting the sacred lot, or by other means. Naturally he also offered sacrifice; but in ancient Israel this was not the exclusive prerogative of the priesthood.² A man not a member of the priestly caste, especially if he were the head of a household, could perform the sacrificial rites—as the Patriarchs had done (Gen. 22₁₃, 26₂₅, 31₅₄), and as Balaam did (Num. 23₁₁) and Gideon and Manoah (Judges 6_{20f.}, 13₁₉)—although he might prefer to avail himself of the services of a priest if there were one at hand (Judges 17_{7ff.}). But in later times, as a result (among other things) of a deepening sense of the transcendent holiness of God and an increasingly complex ritual, which made it more difficult for the layman, the offering of sacrifice became a virtual monopoly of the priesthood, so that at length the only sacrifice a layman could offer without the mediation of a priest was that of the Passover lamb.

What is more, as the priesthood became increasingly preoccupied with the sacrificial rites, which grew more and more elaborate, the teaching aspect of the office came to be more and more neglected. This is the chief burden of the prophetic complaint against the priests: not that they offer sacrifice, but that they no longer teach the people (Hos. 4₆; Mal. 2_{6f.}; cf. Ezek. 44_{23f.}). If some of the prophets seem hostile to the entire sacrificial system as such (Amos 5₂₅; Jer. 7₂₂; Isa. 1_{11f.}), most of them—and probably in fact all of them—protest rather against the abuse of it.³ In origin and in essence the offering of sacrifice is an occasion and a means of establishing, strengthening, or restoring communion between God and men; but it easily comes to be conceived as an instrument at the disposal of men, something which men can, as it were, manipulate in order to exert an influence upon God and get their own way with Him. It is such a perversion of the idea of sacrifice that essentially arouses the prophetic ire; and it is no doubt due to the influence of the prophets that teaching is given first place among the duties of priests in the passage quoted above from Deuteronomy.

But when the living voice of prophecy had ceased to be heard, and the Word of God was enshrined in Scripture, the exposition of the written Word, the Law, became the province of the Scribes, whose influence in post-exilic Judaism was immense.⁴ Some of these in the earlier stages, and perhaps as long as the priesthood lasted, were priests—like 'Ezra the priest the scribe' (Neh. 8₉), who was traditionally the first of them. But the priesthood as a whole never restored its teaching function to first place, although it was always interested, naturally, in having the people instructed as to the duty of maintaining the sacrificial cultus. More and more, priestly interest was concentrated on the cultus, in which emphasis was laid more and more on expiatory and atoning sacrifices. It is not surprising, therefore, if for this and other reasons, the Scribes, the interpreters of the Law, came in course of time to form a quite distinct and separate class, associated most closely, not with the priesthood, but with the Pharisees.

In this connexion it is interesting to observe that our Lord, who in many ways stands in line with the prophetic tradition, has next to nothing to say about the priests, and His words contain nothing like the denunciations of the sacrificial cultus that are so characteristic of the prophets. His most frequent and scathing criticisms are directed, not at these, but at the Scribes and Pharisees, who in a sense are the direct successors of the prophets, and who yet, as He sees it, disastrously misinterpret the Word and will of God. At the same time, He makes

little or no use of language and imagery drawn from the Temple and its services in His teaching or in His descriptions of Himself and His mission, or with reference to His disciples. He does, however, envisage the destruction of the Temple, and with it presumably also that of the priesthood and the sacrifices and all that belongs together with them. And this in fact took place.

But it was not primarily the physical destruction of the Temple that brought its significance to an end for the first Christians; it was the inauguration of the New Covenant through the priestly mediation and sacrifice of Christ. The Temple with its priesthood and its sacrifices belonged to the old order, the Old Covenant, that was now superseded by the New. Christ as a new and greater Moses had accomplished a new Exodus through the sacrifice of Himself as a Passover lamb (1 Cor 5), leaving Judaism, like the land of bondage, far behind. He had consecrated Himself as at once priest and victim in sacrifice to God on behalf of men (John 17₁₉), and had thereby made a complete and perfect atonement for their sins, once for all (Heb. 7₂₇, 9₁₂, 10₁₀). As a 'priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek', and not a member of the old Aaronic, Levitical priesthood, He had secured the forgiveness of sins and permanently open access to God for all who would come to God through Him. There was therefore neither need nor room for any further sacrifice for sins, or for any other priestly mediation than His. The old order was thus, as the writer to the Hebrews says, completely set aside (Heb. 7_{12ff.}, 18, 10_{8ff.}, 17₁).

In consequence of this, there is in the New Testament Church no separated priesthood. Nowhere in the whole New Testament is any particular class of persons in the Church described as priests. There are those who exercise special ministries, or hold special offices, such as apostles, prophets, evangelists, presbyters, bishops, deacons; but none of them is ever called a priest, nor are their functions described in the language of priesthood. Instead, the whole Church is regarded as a priestly community, and all its members are priests, or perhaps rather, they share in its priestly character. As the Body of which Christ is the Head, the Church naturally shares in the priestly character of Christ, and as members of the Body individual Christians share in it also. We can, indeed, say that every Christian is a priest, so long as we remember that he is so only as a member of the universal priesthood of the Church, and not in his own individual right. Hence there is no special priesthood in the Christian Church, because the Church *is* a priesthood and all Christians are priests—not some more, some less, but all alike sharing in the priestly character of the Body of Christ.

It cannot, however, be said that there are no longer any sacrifices offered in the Christian Church; indeed, the offering of sacrifice, as St Peter tells us, is an essential part of the Church's priestly functions. But in order not to misunderstand this, it should be observed that our Lord by His self-offering has quite changed the meaning of sacrifice.⁵ It now means essentially self-sacrifice in the service of others, and there is no longer any question of our bringing gifts and offerings to God in order to expiate our sins and secure His favour. Our sins have been expiated once for all by Christ's self-sacrifice for us, and what we are called upon to offer are 'spiritual sacrifices', as St Peter calls them. They are sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, of prayer, of devoted service to the Gospel, of alms to help the poor, and above all, of ourselves. It is in connexion with such things as these that the New Testament uses language borrowed from the sacrificial cultus.⁶

But there is, as we have seen, another function of priesthood besides that of offering sacrifice. The priest has not only, nor even primarily, to approach God on behalf of men, but he has to speak to men in the name of God. These two aspects of priesthood, it is interesting to notice, are represented in the Epistle to the Hebrews by two different titles applied to our Lord: He is 'the Apostle and Highpriest of our confession' (Heb. 3₁)—Apostle as coming from God to men, Highpriest as going from men to God. In the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, both aspects can be observed together, as He intercedes in his great highpriestly prayer (John 17) for those to whom He has spoken the Divine Word, and for whom He now prepares to offer Himself in sacrifice.

Both aspects of priestly service are also present, we may note, in the Church's worship, and especially in the central act of all, the Lord's Supper, the Eucharist. Here we proclaim the Lord's death until He come (1 Cor 11₂₆), and thus we make known the most wonderful of all the wonderful deeds of God. Here also we offer a spiritual sacrifice—our prayers and praises, our alms and oblations, our souls and bodies, to be used in His service, as our grateful response to His self-offering for us. In this way every member of the royal priesthood is called to take his part in the priestly service of the whole Church—a service which, it should be emphasized, while it centres in the Eucharist, does not stop there. It goes out into all the world, where Christians in every walk of life have the duty of witnessing, not only with their lips, but by their lives, to the truth of God in Christ, and just in this way offering their spiritual sacrifices to God.

Now this doctrine of the universal priesthood of all believers was known and understood also in the post-apostolic Church. Justin Martyr speaks of Christians as 'the true high-priestly race' (*Dial.* 116); Irenaeus says that 'all the righteous have priestly rank' (*Adv. Haer.* iv. 8, 3); Tertullian asks, 'Are not we laymen also priests?' (*Exhort. ad cast.* vii.; cf. *De monog.* vii.) and declares, 'we are the true priests, who, praying in spirit, sacrifice in spirit prayer—a victim proper and acceptable to God' (*De orat.* 28). Even Augustine, at a much later date, can say that the promise in Rev. 20₆

refers not to the bishops alone, and presbyters, who are now specially called priests in the Church; but as we call all believers Christians on account of the mystical chrism, so we call all priests because they are members of the one Priest (*De civ. Dei* xx. 10).

At the same time, as the last quotation has indicated, the Christian ministry, the office-bearers in the Church, gradually came to be spoken of as priests, and to be distinguished as priests from the laity. This was chiefly due, no doubt, to the fact that the Old Testament, with its account of the Levitical priesthood, was for long the only Scripture the Church possessed, and that neither Jewish nor Gentile Christians were at all accustomed to the idea of a religion without a special priesthood. Hence it is hardly surprising to find Clement of Rome taking the sacerdotal system of Judaism, including the distinction between priest and layman, as a model for Christian Church order (1 *Cl.* 40f.), or the Didache describing Christian prophets as 'your high priests' (*Did.* xiii. 3). Nor is there anything unnatural—or anything necessarily illegitimate—in Tertullian's description of the bishop as *summus sacerdos* (*De bapt.* 17), or in Hippolytus's assertion that the successors of the apostles are 'participators in the same grace, high-priesthood, and office of teaching' (*Ref.* I, proem.). For what could be more

reasonable—if this is all they meant—than to give the title of high priest to the leading persons in the Church regarded as a community of priests? But this was not all. Before long we find Eusebius calling the clergy, as distinct from the laity, 'priests' (*Eccl. Hist.* x. 4, 2), and as we have already seen, this was the common practice in Augustine's time. In consequence, the universal priesthood of all believers, even when it was not quite forgotten, came to be decidedly subordinated to the special priesthood of the ministry.

This development, moreover, was accompanied and further encouraged by a change in the sacrificial understanding of the Eucharist. Although the New Testament idea of 'spiritual sacrifice' was not lost,⁷ there was already in the second century a shifting of emphasis from the self-offering of the Church as the Body of Christ, to the offering of the eucharistic Bread and Wine (Just., *Dial.* 41; Iren., *Adv. Haer.* iv. 18, 1ff.). In the third century, Cyprian says that 'the Lord's passion is the sacrifice which we offer' (*Ep.* lxiii. 17); and he regards it as a sacrifice that avails not only for the living, but even for the dead, and holds the offering of it to be the primary function of the ordained priest (*Ep.* lxxv). In the fourth century, Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of it as 'a spiritual sacrifice, a bloodless service, a propitiatory sacrifice' (*Cat. Myst.* v. 4), and claims that it is nothing less than Christ slain on our behalf that is offered (*ibid.* 10). It is not surprising, therefore, that by the end of the fifth century, the Canon of the Mass had already taken shape.

The reason for these developments was no doubt in part to meet the pagan objection that Christians had no sacrifices and were therefore atheists, and in part to meet a need felt in the Church for atonement for post-baptismal sin.⁸ But it is clear that the idea of 'spiritual sacrifice' underwent a sea-change in the process. The priestly self-offering of the Church in gratitude to God, and for His service in the world, gave place to an offering by the ordained priest of the Body and Blood of Christ on behalf of the Church. Moreover, since none but an ordained priest was able to offer this sacrifice, the priestly character of the ministry came to be conceived as of a different kind from that of other Christians. The ordained priesthood became the mediator between the laity and God.

The essential change in this direction had taken place already by the third century (Cyprian), and by the time of the Reformation the same kind of situation had arisen in the New Israel as existed in the Old in the time of the prophets and our Lord. The priests were pre-occupied with the cultus, which was centred in the sacrifice of the Mass, and their teaching office was practically forgotten—or at best was fulfilled in terms of a scholastic theology that might well recall the spirit and method of the Scribes and Pharisees. Against all this the Reformers raised their protest like the prophets of ancient Israel; and one of the chief planks in their reforming platform was the doctrine of the universal priesthood of all believers, which they rescued from the virtual oblivion into which it had fallen.⁹ For the most part, the communions that have followed them have ceased to call their ministers priests; and even where they have not, they have deprived them of any monopoly of priestly prerogatives by repudiating the idea of the sacrifice of the Mass.

PHILIP S. WATSON

(To be Concluded)

⁷ See N. H. Snaith, 'The Priesthood and the Temple', in *A Companion to the Bible*, ed. T. W. Manson (T. & T. Clark, 1939), pp. 418ff.; H. W. Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament* (O.U.P., 1946), pp. 200ff.; *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (= RGG),

HEALING IN THE EARLY CHURCH

I

INTRODUCTORY

WRITERS on spiritual healing must be concerned about the practice of the early Church, but often the historical part of their subject receives scant treatment. Three assumptions are frequently made:

1. That in the apostolic age healing was a main item in the Church's ministrations, until spiritual ardour cooled and general decline set in.

2. That the Church's triumph in the Roman Empire (312) was a tragedy, resulting in a nominal Christianity from which no such vitality could be expected.

3. That healing by material means displaced the spiritual. One writer, with a preacher's love of epigram, expresses it: 'Man had discovered drugs; he could do without God.'

I am uneasy about all three points. Let us take the third point first. Drugs *versus* God, medical skill in contrast to faith healing—where is such antithesis going to lead us? The attitude is represented in the early Church, e.g. by Tatian, who classes roots and herbs along with amulets as means which devils use.¹ St Luke, who tells us most regarding apostolic practice, was himself a physician. St Paul, on whom he dwells in fullest detail, suffered from a thorn in the flesh concerning which he had to learn that prayer would not remove it, but would supply grace to help him to endure. May not fortitude in suffering, or service of the sufferer, reveal Christ's presence as convincingly as miracles of healing?

Then the second point: It may accord with Protestant prejudice to bewail the Constantinian triumph of the Church, but historical fact comes first. The fact is that Augustine and Jerome are the greatest of the Latin Fathers, Basil and Chrysostom are the greatest of the Greek, Ephraim is the greatest of the Syriac, and all belong to this century. Christian service of suffering at this period was effective enough to win the unwilling admiration of Julian the Apostate.² To

IV,1833ff.; Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.* (=TWNT), III,259ff.; Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (=HDB), IV,67ff.; Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (=ERE), X,307ff.; *A Theological Word-Book of the Bible*, ed. A. Richardson (S.C.M. Press, 1950), pp.210f.

¹ On sacrifice see: HDB, IV,329ff.; ERE, XI,24ff., 31ff.; RGG, IV,959ff.; TWNT, III,180ff.; H. W. Robinson, op. cit., 225ff.; N. H. Snaith, op. cit., 434ff.

² It will be recalled that some of the prophets were themselves priests.

³ On the Scribes see: HDB, IV,420ff.; N. H. Snaith, op. cit., 432ff.; L. Rabinowitz, 'The Scribes and the Law', in Manson, op. cit., 444ff.

⁴ TWNT, III,184.

⁵ The idea of 'spiritual sacrifice' is not unanticipated in the Old Testament; cf. Psalm 49, 50^{14,20}, 51¹⁰, 107²², 141²; cf. 40^{8ff.} (quoted in Heb. 10^{8ff.}). In the New Testament it finds varying expression, as in Romans 12¹, 15^{16,28ff.}; 2 Corinthians 9¹²; Ephesians 5²; Philippians 2¹⁷, 4¹⁸; 2 Timothy 4⁸; Revelation 8¹. See further E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of Peter* (Macmillan, 1947), pp.161f.

⁶ TWNT, III,189f.

⁷ Cf. E. C. Ratcliffe, 'Eucharist', in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th edn.), VIII,795a.

⁸ Luther speaks of it in all three of his reforming treatises of 1520, though he develops it most fully in the *Address to the Christian Nobility*. In this he says: 'As St Paul says in 1 Corinthians 12, we are all one body, yet every member has its own work, whereby it serves every other, all because we have one baptism, one gospel, one faith, and are all alike Christians. . . . Through baptism all of us are consecrated to the priesthood, as St Peter says in 1 Peter 2⁹ . . . and the Book of Revelation (verse 10) says . . . ' In the *Babylonian Captivity* he says: 'We are all priests, as many of us as are Christians. But the priests, as we call them, are ministers chosen from among us, who do all that they do in our name. And the priesthood is nothing but a ministry, as we learn from 1 Corinthians 4¹. . . .'

bewail the coming of the Imperial State Church is one-sided judgement upon an event which put Christianity on the map, established it so effectively in one significant area of the world that it would outlast a civilization, and remain as the nucleus for the next, the only Christian civilization which the world has seen, our western civilization of the last 1,000 years. I do not so read Christian history as to join in this lament.

And so back to the first point: I am unpersuaded about post-apostolic decline. In spite of much which the New Testament contains (the Epistles to Corinth, for example) the apostolic age has been idealized by each succeeding generation. Was healing so universally practised, or with unfailing results? Cases reported to us are described as marvels. If universal, or even usual, would a sense of the miraculous have remained?

Having expressed these dissatisfactions, let us turn to history and inquire (1) what in the early centuries men believed about illness, (2) what Christians believed about healing as practised by non-Christians, and (3) what Christians claimed for their own healing.

I. WHAT IN THE EARLY CENTURIES MEN BELIEVED ABOUT ILLNESS

Illness was regarded as due to some influence disturbing the make-up of the body. This might be something physical, something psychical, or a combination of both. Cure might be sought in any, or all, of three ways: (1) One might go to a physician, who would prescribe drugs, diet, bathing, bleeding, rest, exercise, or surgical operation. (2) One might resort to a temple, or an oracle, and there hope for some supernatural revelation with regard to cure—a forecast of whether one would be cured, a dream directing to method of cure, the actual experience of being cured by the god or the powers related to him in that place. This healing might be instantaneous and miraculous, or gradual and related to treatment. In some temples of Asklepios, for example, there was provision for a prolonged stay.³ (3) At a lower level than methods 1 and 2, but universal (as indeed it is today), there was belief in charms, used to guard against illness or to cure it.

Christians shared the general beliefs which lay behind these practices, but with certain differences. Most notable was the Christians' interpretation of the psychical side, both of illness and of healing. The gods of the heathen, from whose kingdom they had been delivered by Christ, they identified with the evil spirits who were the real enemies of man. This identification means that in Christian literature of the first three centuries that which is most mentioned is illness thought to be caused by possession, and healing which is related to exorcism. Christians did, of course, believe in illnesses with merely physical causes, but the psychical side was more interesting, and more relevant to the subjects of preachers and apologists.

One of the earliest of such voices is that of Tatian 'the Assyrian' (i.e. from Iraq, c. 150). Tatian believes that demons are fallen angels, usurpers who have got themselves accepted by the heathen as gods, and arbiters of fate. Christians, he rejoices, are superior to fate and able to challenge its controllers. Demons have no flesh, but are akin to the soul which is in us. It is by means of our material bodies, and their material needs, that the demons make war on man. Tatian tends towards dualism, and this is not surprising when one remembers from how far east he comes. He believes that the ascetic life, and repudiation

of matter, provide the way to victory. Some diseases, he says, are just disturbances of the matter that is in us, but the demons jump in and make it seem that they are the cause, which may or may not be the case. Their motive is to get the sufferer to look to them for the cure, and so to increase their hold upon him.⁴

Tertullian of Carthage (c. 190) belongs to the western Latin end of the Church, far removed from Tatian and the Syriac east, yet his view is only slightly different:

The work of demons is the subversion of mankind. So they inflict our bodies with ill-health and other sharp mischances, and the soul they force into sudden and strange excesses. They have entry to both parts of our nature.⁵ First they hurt a man; then to get a miracle out of it they commend remedies, either new or contrary; after which, withdrawing the hurtful influences, they get the credit for a cure (*Apology*, 22).

Another Latin apologist of the same period, Minucius Felix, similarly declares:

It is unclean spirits, demons, which lurk beneath images . . . inspire soothsayers, linger in shrines. . . . They upset life, disturb sleep, and, creeping into bodies secretly . . . they contrive illnesses, disturb minds, distort limbs, to compel men to their veneration. Then, gorged with the altars' fumes and the cattle sacrificed, by loosing what they had bound, they seem to have made a cure. So also with the frenzied whom you see rushing out in the street—soothsayers without a temple, they rage, they rave, they roll, like in that theirs too is the urge of a demon, unlike in the theme of their madness' (*Octavius*, 27).

The *Clementine Homilies* are second- and third-century Ebionite reconstructions of St Peter's missionary preaching. Ascetic and dualist, they probably originated in Syria, but were widely circulated. They say that demons enter a man with excess of food, lie hid, and become blended with his own soul. Their purpose is to borrow a body, in order to experience delights of the flesh otherwise closed to them—gluttony, drunkenness, and sexual intercourse. So the best way to put demons to flight is abstinence, fasting, affliction of the body, along with prayer that the hand of God may touch and heal. In thorough believers demons can obtain no footing. The deceptions which demons practise on their victims this writer illustrates in the opposite direction from Tatian. Demons lead a man to believe that his illness has a physical cause:

Acidity, bile, phlegm, blood pressure (αἵματος ἀμετρίας), fibrositis (μῆνιγγος φλεγμονῆς) . . . but even if this were so, one could not get away from its being a kind of demon (*Clementine Homilies*, ix, 9-11).

Cyprian Bishop of Carthage, writing about 250, adopts the passage from Minucius Felix (quoted above) word for word, and, as is the way with the Fathers, without acknowledgement. In another context, however, I find him speaking about illness in a different way. Plague has struck Carthage. The Bishop gives no hint of his ascription of this to demons. He is at pains to tell Christians that in this case their triumph is not to be *over* disease, but *under* it:

It troubles some that this diseased condition should carry off our folk equally with the heathen. As if a Christian accepted the Faith in order to be immune from contact with the ills of life! . . . A smarting of the eyes, the attack of fever, weakness of all the

limbs, these are common to us with the rest so long as this common flesh is worn by us in this world. . . . Righteous men have always possessed endurance (*De Mortalitate*, 8).

Perhaps one would hesitate to generalize after the examination of so few sources if the conclusion to which they point were not precisely this, that with illness one cannot generalize. Illness may be due to physical causes. A physical illness may be complicated by demons taking occasion to interfere and to pretend that they are the cause. Illness may be due to psychical causes, i.e. demons actually inflicting the suffering to damage of both body and soul. In this case part of the demons' guile may be to deceive the patient into thinking that it is only physical.

II. CHRISTIAN BELIEF ABOUT HEALING AS PRACTISED BY NON-CHRISTIANS

Five statements seem to be relevant here:

1. Tatian writes:

Suffering is not removed by counter-measures (*ἀντιπάθεια*), nor is a lunatic cured by hanging leathern thongs about him. These are inspirations of demons. . . . Just as the letters of the alphabet do not make verse of themselves, but need a man to write them, . . . so the variety of roots and lists of tendons and bones are nothing drastic in themselves, but the stuff the rascal demons use. . . . Medicine in all its forms is an artifice. If any trusting in material means finds cure, how much more shall he who waits on the power of God. . . . Even if you have been cured by drugs—to avoid argument I grant you may—the right thing is to ascribe the cure to God. (Tatian, *To the Greeks*, 17-20.)

2. The *Octavius* of Minucius Felix is argument between pagan and Christian. The pagan makes this claim:

Prophets filled with the god, united with him, gather beforehand things to come, give precautions against dangers, remedies for illnesses, hope for the afflicted, help to the wretched, comfort in calamities, a lightening of toil.

To the Christian this is a misreading. As we have seen, such heathen ecstasy he classes with the raving of maniacs, devil-possessed. And if demons do let go of a man, it is only to make him beholden to them, and so in a subtle way even more securely theirs.

3. The writer of the *Clementine Homilies* shares this view. He begins by denying that the heathen gods, themselves evil spirits, do work cures, and then continues:

But granted it so, that would not make such a one a god. Physicians do many cures but are not gods. 'But', one may say, 'spirits heal oracularly.' They are knowledgeable physicians, able to cure diseases curable by men. They can foretell when a disease will right itself. They arrange their remedies so as to get the credit themselves. (ix, 16.)

4. In the *Contra Celsum* of Origen (248), the anti-Christian Celsus is ready to accept the healing miracles of our Lord, but, he says, these are not by any means unique. There are quacks in the marketplace who,

If you show them a few coppers will show you their venerable arts. They will cast out devils, blow away diseases.

Origen's reply is:

None of these magicians calls upon the spectators because of his tricks to amend their lives, nor does he take those amazed at the show and train them in the fear of God, nor persuade the audience so to live as men who will be judged by God. They do not do this because they cannot, and have neither the will nor the intent. . . . Moral reformation was the grand purpose of our Lord (*Contra Celsum*, i, 68).

Celsus in another passage says:

There are many who have often seen and still see Asklepios coming to heal men.

Origen expresses doubt, says Christian evidences are worthier of belief, and proceeds:

Suppose I grant you that a demon called Asklepios does heal the body. That is a thing indeterminate, a gift not to nice people only but to nasty ones as well (*Contra Celsum*, iii, 25).

5. Arnobius is a Latin writer, belonging to Sicca in North Africa, who was converted to the Faith during the final persecutions in 303. Concerning the healing miracles of our Lord, he asks:

Was He a mortal, one of our number, who could do these things? . . . You may reply that other gods give remedies and heal. I do not ask which god, and when, gave help to whom, restored to health from what ailment, but only this: Was it healing at a word or touch, without medicine? . . . Report says that such a medicine was ordered, such a diet given, a dose of herbs of a certain quality, or application of the sap of plants to the affected parts, exercise, rest, or abstention from something harmful. What matter? This is how physicians cure. And a physician is a creature born on earth, uncertain of the truth of his knowledge, one engaged in conjecture, and proceeding by trial and error. . . . How many thousands are there whose illness no medicine cures? They come as suppliants at every temple, prostrate themselves before the place of the gods, sweep the very thresholds with their lips, and, for what remains to them of life, they weary Asklepios himself the so-called health-giver with their prayers, and call out with piteous pleading. Do we not know some who have died with their diseases, and others who have grown old in their illness' pain? What good is it to point to one or other who happens to find cure, when every shrine is filled with the wretched and unfortunate? (*Adversus Gentes*, i, 46-9).

A stirring apologist this, but one who leaves us with an uncomfortable feeling. For among Christians too is it not the exceptional few who are healed, whether in New Testament times or since?⁶ To sum up: The cure of illness is in itself neither evil nor good. Physicians are not necessarily good men. Magicians have not the right motives. Demons may themselves contribute towards a cure, but only to strengthen their hold upon a man.

Before passing on, it may be appropriate to remark about this prevailing emphasis on demonology. Among the advocates of a return to 'spiritual healing' as practised in the early Church, I find exorcism less prominent than might have been expected.⁷ On the other hand, in current writing on biblical theology, I do find those who urge that, in order to recover New Testament Christianity,

we must recover the New Testament writers' belief in demons.⁸ For my part, I would as soon try to recover belief that the world is a flat oblong plane.

The subject of healing as practised by the non-Christian leads me to recall words spoken to me as a minister by a medical doctor: 'Half the people who come to me ought to be coming to you.' The sense of spiritual need among his patients drove that doctor back to the Church, and, thus returning, he has been more able to help people in spirit as well as in body. Surely it is in terms of modern psycho-somatic thought, *not* the demonology of the early centuries, that we need to recover the New Testament belief in the power of the Risen Christ to speak to men's condition. Then we need to express it *somehow* in the work of the ministry. As to how, we may perhaps find some direction as we turn to the claims of the early Christians with regard to their cures.

JOHN FOSTER

(To be Concluded)

¹ See p.220.

² To be quoted in Part II of this article (October 1957).

³ See Mary Hamilton, *Incubation*.

⁴ Tatian, *To the Greeks*, 12, 16.

⁵ Tertullian is no dualist; not all evil is put down to the body.

⁶ It is hardly to be expected that Christian writers of the early centuries will dwell on failures in Christian attempts at healing. Some evidence is to be found in references to the 'possessed' (*ἐνεργούμενοι*), a group of unfortunates sometimes attached to a local church. For them special prayers were said, but to the end there were those who failed to find a cure, for there is included with directions for the prayers this regulation: 'If any one has a demon, let him be instructed in religion, but not received into communion until he is cleansed. If at death's last gasp, let him be received' (*Apostolic Constitutions*, viii, 6, 32). A non-Christian might borrow the words of Arnobius and say: 'They have grown old in their illness' pain and died with their diseases.'

⁷ So also J. S. McEwen, in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 'The Ministry of Healing', June 1954. An important contribution, though I question his limitation of 'demon-possession' to what we should call hysteria. My references suggest something much wider.

⁸ Professor J. S. Stewart, in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 'On a neglected emphasis in N.T. Theology', September 1951.

HOPE NO MORE VAIN

I

*Never and never, Lord, shall I begin
To see you clearly or to love you truly,
Unmixed in motive, free from the unruly
Tempests of passion and refusal! Win
Nevertheless my most reluctant yes!
Take, if need be by storm, my heart's last keep!
Make ransom of the tears that I must weep,
But rescue me, late or last, to tenderness!*

*Late have I loved you pursuant Father;
Late have I left repentance and repair;
Late have I cried to you from my despair,
As if uncertain temporal joy I'd rather
Have than your certain gift of grace. O never,
Nevertheless, Lord, let me lose you ever!*

II

*We shall not move nor break that Timeless Care,
Nor ever from its consequence be free,
Nor lost to love (however wan despair
Tempt us to curse our days), nor shall we be
As though that Love were not. Come griefs or joys,
In early Edens and in later loss,
Christ's everlasting mercy still employs
All as a stratagem till we take His cross.*

*We shall not fall so far He cannot reach,
His tireless following we cannot shun,
Does not His age-long patience wait to teach
Our unregenerate hearts what Love has done?
His Light shall find us out, His searching ray
Conquer our night and need, our griefs allay.*

III

*Moving already to brightness, all along
The heavenward walks, with prodigal grace for lantern,
Goes the hope of my hurt heart amid the pattern
Of consolations brighter than frost, and song
Bursts from my throat, and cloudward I soar
In the high tides of prayer; the currents of grace
Bathe me in charity; O my fond flesh
Already forgotten in the ecstatic finding,*

*More than grief or grave loss and the guilt at my ankle
Is this moving to brightness and this dream
Wider than waking, warmer than wishes, wise
Beyond needs. O and a great sun-splendour
And a sudden Son-knowing circle me. Deep
In this sudden height of finding and fire all is made tender.*

IV

*I sing the duel of death and love, I wrest
Song, grace and care out of the elements
Of day, hour, deed. I, held in sin's arrest,
Burst my will's bars; for who, Christ-bought, repents
Finds life abundant, miracles abounding,
Hope no more vain, promise on every bough.
His life leaps Godward into God's surrounding
Bounty. Thus moves the spirit in me now.*

*I wrest from loss and all my dark unknowing
Perfection's garland and eternity's flower.
Mine is the harvest, though seeds of His sowing,
Mine is the fruit, though His the kindling power.
So that in word and act I prove anew
His hope, His honour and His Kingdom true.*

FREDERIC VANSON

THE UNREASON IN MODERN PHILOSOPHY

IMAGINE the following situation: Complaints are made that the food at a students' hostel is bad and lacks nourishment and that in consequence the students have an anaemic look. The warden, let us further imagine, offers the following defence:

- (1) It is true that our methods of cooking are different from those used elsewhere, but then all progress in cooking is the result of change of method.
- (2). We do use some, though not all, of the ingredients of ordinary cooking, such as flour, fat, etc.
- (3) As to the ingredients which we do not use, I believe, though I do not propose

to offer any supporting arguments, that those who used these ingredients would find, if they went into the matter, that they were not nourishing and were rather boring.

Perhaps you will agree with me that our warden has not made out a very impressive case, but this is, in fact, a paraphrase of the arguments which Mr Wollheim offers in defence of modern British philosophy ('Modern Philosophy and Unreason', *Political Quarterly*, July 1955).

Linguistic analysis is on the defensive, and Mr Wollheim lists some of its attackers. We might add to these Mr Berlin, Mr Hampshire, and Miss Murdoch, who severely maul Mr Quinton in the Oxford number of the *Twentieth Century*. The charge, in Mr Wollheim's own words is: 'Instead of dealing with those vast, deep problems which have perennially troubled the human mind, philosophy's contemporary practitioners spend their time worrying over small verbal points. . . .' Further on in the article he gives an exposition of the retreat of contemporary philosophy from the uncompromising position of the logical positivism of a few decades ago. If his defence of the present position is any indication of its strength, the retreat is likely to turn into a rout in the near future.

I have already indicated the outlines of his apologia in my initial analogy. There is a change in method, he says, but, after all, changes in method have initiated important philosophic developments; some of the problems of philosophy are still being dealt with, and those which are not would, on inspection, turn out to be fruitless and boring. There is hardly any need to demonstrate the logical fallacies in this piece of reasoning—surely a piece of 'unreason in philosophy' itself. It is enough to say that it does not meet the charge of actual sterility, and only offers a counter assertion to the charge of not dealing with important problems. What is at issue is not the concern with linguistic analysis as such. As linguistic analysts would be the first to assert, much of traditional philosophy is, or can be, interpreted as concern with linguistic usage. The crux of the matter is rather whether philosophic method—whatever form it may take—can produce conclusions about the meaning of human life, or can only show us the emptiness of such an undertaking and the necessary neutrality of philosophy. The latter alternative denies the relevance of reason to the setting of our goals and aspirations, and this is the charge against contemporary British philosophy. Mr Wollheim is dimly aware of this and adds some arguments on the more specific topic of moral philosophy.

Here his argument runs roughly as follows: Moral philosophy, which claims to offer some moral guidance as well, suffers from the following faults:

- (1) It does not achieve true generality, because beliefs are still divided.
- (2) The necessity claimed for such principles is spurious, for they can be denied without self-contradiction.
- (3) Such an attitude is pontifical, based on a belief in the infallibility of the moral philosopher, and thus undermines responsible individual choices.

In contrast, linguistic analysis, concentrating on the language in which we express moral judgements, can achieve true generality and even necessity. It determines the place of reasoning in moral judgements and thus makes them comprehensible; by rejecting authoritative solutions it shows the true reason for the necessity of individual judgements.

We must note, above all, the charge that traditional philosophy is pontifical and believes in the infallibility of the philosopher, while linguistic analysis is presumably reasonable and modest. This charge is not new; it is, indeed, part of the stock in trade of linguistic analysts. (I recollect, for instance, a similar point being made by Professor Ayer.) This, however, is either slipshod thinking or a disingenuous piece of demagogic mud-slinging. Two entirely different contrasts are confused. There is, firstly, the contrast between offering definite conclusions and suspending one's judgement and, secondly, the contrast between being pontifical—that is, refusing to reason—and being open to argument, basing oneself on evidence, etc. There is no logical connection between those two contrasts; one can be pontifical about reaching conclusions or about not reaching conclusions, and one may be equally reasonable about either. For instance, Mr Quinton, in the discussion already referred to, says: 'The logical detachment of philosophy from *Weltanschauung* . . . was made clearly enough by, for instance, Dilthey.' A close knowledge of Dilthey's voluminous and untranslated works could not be presupposed in his readers, and the statement, though possibly true, is certainly not uncontroversial; yet it is made without qualification, without supporting argument or textual reference. This seems to me therefore a pontifical statement. But, of course, Mr Quinton is a linguistic analyst.

Generally speaking, what linguistic analysts want to assert is that other philosophers propound general conclusions, theories, etc., while they themselves do not. They cannot, I think, maintain that traditional philosophers do not support their conclusions by chains of reasoning and submit them to argument. Yet the analysts prefer to describe their difference from traditional philosophers by calling them pontifical, and attaching the ironical notion of infallibility to them.

In this and in his discussion of generality and necessity, Mr Wollheim sets up a man of straw in order to knock it down. Aristotle, to take one of Mr Wollheim's own examples, certainly did not claim for his Mean the necessity and generality which Mr Wollheim demands. On the contrary, he based his conclusions on inductions from the practice of his age and tried to generalize from the best practice of contemporaries. Yet his conclusions may be worth having. Equally, modern philosophers might make articulate and submit to comparison the goals and aspirations of our civilization, and discuss the relation of means and ends, thus guiding and helping their less reflective contemporaries. So the philosopher would glean from his analytical labours a harvest of normative suggestions. This, surely, is a reasonable position to take, as against the arid alternative between ethical neutrality and the pronouncement with apodictic certainty of *a priori* principles.

The formulation of such norms, or for that matter of any general moral principles, does not make individual decision in concrete circumstances superfluous. The majority of philosophers have certainly not considered it their task to give concrete advice like those benevolent figures who counsel the correspondents of women's magazines. To make responsible decisions remains a personal matter, but principles are not irrelevant; indeed, we can only make responsible decisions by considering the principles to which we ought to adhere.

Having cleared up these general points, let us consider the curious position

which Mr Wollheim assigns to the linguistic study of moral problems.

The linguistic analyst is, of course, concerned with the language in which we express our moral judgements, and 'This philosophic theory led directly to an inquiry into the reasons that we give for them: for how else do we, can we, establish them save by a process of reasoning? To understand these reasons, to see how we employ them is to understand the judgements; to ignore, to discount the reasons renders the whole process of moral adjudication incomprehensible'.

This sounds most promising. Here, surely, we have experts on the methods by which we arrive at normal judgements, and, if we study them, we too can become experts. But here we become aware of a curious state of affairs. These methods are not methods of reaching conclusions. 'For to stand on the side of reason is a matter, not of arriving at certain conclusions, but of using certain methods'. When the moral philosopher of the modern school, who has become an expert on the reasons we give for moral propositions, has to make a moral decision himself, he must do so 'not *ex cathedra*, but as an ordinary thinking and acting *engagé* human being'. In other words, his expertise is of no use to him.

Now, this position seems to me distinctly curious. If I take a difficult mathematical problem to a professor of mathematics, he may either teach me the methods or techniques by which to solve the problem, thus showing me the necessary conclusion, or he may work it out for me. I should then be given the conclusion, and at the same time treated to the application of his methods in a chain of reasoning, following which I should gain the conviction that the conclusion is demonstrably the right one. We know also that, let us say, theoretical physicists not only evolved methods of investigation, but also applied such knowledge in helping with the construction of atomic research stations. Without overstraining the analogy between science and moral philosophy, we can maintain that there is a general relation between theory and practice. This is surely one of the reasons for the value of theory. If we ask what possible grounds the linguistic analyst can have for denying the relevance of moral theory to moral practice, and asserting the entire distinctness of methods and conclusions, only one answer occurs to us: the analyst does not believe that the reasons he studies are real reasons, and thinks that moral decisions are made on a plane untouched by reason. Whether this position is right or wrong, it is surely the belief in unreason with which the linguistic analysts are charged. Though Mr Wollheim is a little coy about it, he really admits the charge in full. Even if he were to deny these implications, he is still left impaled on the horns of a genuine dilemma: either philosophic reflection and analysis is relevant to moral decision—and then the analysts are wrong in maintaining their neutrality and condemning those who derive moral conclusions from their philosophic thinking as pontifical—or the analysts' reflections are practically irrelevant and can only serve to entertain fellow philosophers. If he accepts the first alternative, he must, in penitential garb, return to the gates of traditional philosophy; if he chooses the latter alternative, he admits the charge of unreason, of excluding the most crucial field of human activity from the range of reason and of fiddling while Rome burns.

H. P. RICKMAN

Recent Literature

Edited by R. NEWTON FLEW

The Buddha, the Prophet, and the Christ, by F. H. Hilliard. (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.)
The Early Christian Fathers, edited and translated by H. Bettenson. (O.U.P., 16s.)

Dr Hilliard seeks to show that both Buddhism and Islam evince a tendency to attribute somewhat the same kind of supernatural attributes to Gautama and Muhammad as the Christian faith ascribes to Christ. In all three religions, he claims, there are to be found beliefs in the pre-existence of the founder, a birth out of the ordinary, a divine call combined with temptations, the power to work miracles, a form of transfiguration, and a death of supernatural significance. It must be said that some of these parallels, especially with regard to Muhammad, are rather forced; that the attempt to evaluate sources, to distinguish between the historical and the legendary, is not always very critically pursued; and that even if it be recognized that this study is concerned rather with beliefs than with facts, the comparison does not touch the essence of any of the three faiths. Dr Hilliard admits that 'the ways in which each of these three religions interprets the nature of ultimate reality . . . are by no means identical'. And his final conclusion is modest enough: 'These three religions unite in declaring' that a 'transcendent spiritual purpose' in life 'has been revealed by—and even in—one who manifests in himself in a special way ultimate reality itself'. But this does not take us very far; and without a more thorough consideration of the essential differences between the three faiths, the dubious and superficial parallels that are here cited tend rather to mislead than to enlighten.

Students of Church history are already indebted to Mr Bettenson for his *Documents of the Christian Church*. They will be equally grateful for *The Early Christian Fathers*, which contains carefully chosen selections from the writings of most of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, including Athanasius as well. As the writings are grouped under authors, it is possible with comparative ease to get a fair picture of the distinctive teaching of each of the Fathers represented, and there is a further subdivision into subjects, which is a great help. The brief biographical introductions are clear and judicious. This is a most valuable text-book, and it is to be hoped that Mr Bettenson will follow it up with a similar volume covering the Post-Nicene Fathers at least to Chalcedon. This would meet an even greater need than that which is so competently supplied by the present work.

G. ERNEST LONG

Jesus' Belief in Man, by Edwin McNeill Poteat. (Abingdon Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$2.50.)

The late Dr E. M. Poteat, American Baptist scholar and pastor, has left us a study of the mind of Jesus intended to provide compensation for the more pessimistic anthropological views which have emerged within current 'neo-orthodox' theology. Starting from, and frequently returning to, the words of John 2₅₅ especially—'he [Jesus] knew what was in man'—the author examines the Temptations, the Sermon on the Mount, and many sayings and parables of Jesus, and finds throughout that Jesus presupposes in those to whom He ministered a point of immediate contact. There was, so runs the thesis, no justification for our Lord's teaching, unless man was, by his nature, already capable of receiving and responding to it. On the Beatitudes, for instance, Dr Poteat writes: 'Unless we are prepared to dismiss his [Jesus's] gay-hearted reassurances as sentimentality, we must accept them as a matured confidence in the stuff of man's soul.' The author is aware of the pitfalls of reading a 'naïve optimism or' an 'amiable liberalism' into the Gospels, but finds that even the Law, which Christ undertook to fulfil, assumes man's capacity to obey as well as to flout it. Though Jesus knew that His admonitions would be totally unheeded by some

and often forgotten by all, yet He believed that there was 'something in the nature of the human spirit' which would respond to them. Man's primeval endowment was not innocence, but Power, a divine attribute. As the Temptation story shows, Jesus demonstrated that power is available for good or evil uses. As representative man, He chose to use His power divinely. 'So also must all men.' Distinction is however made between man's power potential and his ability to use the power available to him. Man is a sinner and impotent to exercise his full endowment; so he needs to draw upon Divine power, and this Jesus promised: 'Ye shall receive power when the Spirit has come upon you.' Jesus restores mankind's confidence in its ability to respond to God's initiative, both by His teaching and by His very Incarnation. This book abounds in stimulation but one reader is not wholly convinced by some of the Biblical interpretation. Is it not, still, more probable that the material of the Sermon on the Mount was directed in the main by the disciples, and that the character of this teaching was determined by the fact that its hearers, unlike the many, had already become followers? Is it not this response, rather than any common quality of humanity, which makes Christ call them 'salt' and 'light'? Again, one feels that Dr Poteat, when he has said all, still does not do justice to the need of mankind for salvation, for a divine act which, apprehended by faith, restores lost power, rather than for divine exhortation which makes active hidden potentialities. The book has many illuminating insights into the mind and teaching of our Lord, and its avowed purpose is one which would seem both salutary and timely. Those who are aware of the trend of recent theology and exegesis, and of the tensions that trend has revealed but not yet resolved, will find here a contribution to a further step in the debate, presented in a vivid and attractive style.

ALFRED H. S. PASK

Worship and Preaching, by Thomas M. Morrow. (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

It is much to be hoped that before long opportunity will serve to allow the Warden of the Wesley Deaconess Order freely to elaborate and to put into a form dictated only by his own inclinations the admirable guidance on the conduct of public worship and on preaching given in his latest book. This book was prepared at the request of the Local Preachers' Department of the Methodist Church to serve as a textbook for those undertaking preparation to become 'fully accredited' lay preachers, and the terms of Mr Morrow's commission leave their mark upon the presentation. That it will admirably fulfil its primary function those acquainted with the situation could not doubt, but its worth ought to be known far beyond the bounds of Methodism and by all who seek to perfect the discharge of the office of leading public worship. What is provided is thorough and comprehensive, and yet is so presented as to disarm the suspicions and quiet the fears of the enthusiastic, sometimes impatient and impetuous, entrant into the lay preacher's vocation. The book makes the conduct of a service seem an altogether more demanding and yet an altogether more worth-while task than a good many initiates have supposed, but it goes far to meet the demands it makes. Rightly, the attention of the preacher (since, such in default of an accepted term which does justice to the welcome title and emphasis of the book, we must call him) is directed away from himself toward, in the first place, God, to whom all worship is offered and, in the second place, the congregation who are to be led to the Throne of Grace. Here is a necessary and effective counter to pulpit vanity, especially common in those with least ground for complacency. Mr Morrow reveals himself as one who is deeply conscious in the pulpit of the Holy Presence, and who is in the pulpit only that others may also become aware of Him. This fundamental yet never-too-often reiterated stress upon the preacher as servant of God and of God's people is, however, not here made by pious exhortation, but by a series of chapters packed with practical advice, all of which, while going far to make the prophet effective, will also keep him

humble. While Mr Morrow writes primarily in the context of the more common form of Methodist Sunday worship, he has John Wesley's catholic spirit and a wide and sympathetic acquaintance with the varied traditions which have sprung from the proclamation of the gospel, and which will increasingly, it is earnestly to be hoped, enrich the whole company of faithful people. Methodists who read and ponder these pages will no longer remain vague as to the grounds for our acts of corporate devotion, nor need they deny to themselves and others an ever-enlarging experience of worship in the fellowship of believers. The local preacher's task and resources being what they are, it can well be understood that the larger section of the book is devoted to sermon-making and sermon delivery. Here the author comforts and gladdens the heart of one who, after thirty years of attempting to preach, still cannot read the rules laid down by the princes of the pulpit without feeling that he has yet to make his first sermon, by stressing that the most excellent practical advice which he gives is meant to constrain and not to constrict. Were this notice to be generally read by inexperienced preachers this comment might be unwise, but the reviewer knows that he is not alone in thinking that those who have felt free to be categorical upon the absolute essentials of a good sermon have themselves been erratic takers of their own medicine! There is a welcome sympathy born of the humility noted above, in all Mr Morrow writes, and this ensures for his book a grateful acceptance by young preachers . . . and by older ones also.

ALFRED H. S. PASK

Wesley: Apostolic Man, by Edgar W. Thompson. (Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.)

At the present time, when in North India a union scheme is being discussed which involves American Methodists, and when British Methodism shares in discussions with the Anglican Church, it is especially important that we should know where we stand on the question of John Wesley's consecration of Dr Thomas Coke. This book, which is warmly to be commended, helps us to make up our mind. All the accuracy and clarity that we associate with the writings of Edgar W. Thompson are here, along with the power to assemble the relevant facts and to make the needed deductions from them. The events connected with the consecration, which Vulliamy said no formalist could justify, are related, and any attempt to exonerate Wesley from full responsibility for them is set aside. Wesley's defence is examined, and found defective. His view that we look in vain to Scripture for rules of Church government that are inflexible and universal is allowed, but Mr Thompson does not find in the writings of Peter King and Edward Stillingfleet all the support for Wesley's action that he himself claimed. Nor does Mr Thompson accept John Wesley's assertion that in this consecration he had not separated from the Anglican Church. Wesley had broken the rules of his Church. 'Ordination is separation', said Lord Mansfield, and in this view Brother Charles concurred. Wesley *had* a sound defence, but it was not the one he used. When he began his Certificate of the Ordination of Coke with the words 'John Wesley . . . Presbyter of the Church of England' he rested his claim on a bad title. In a memorable paragraph the writer states his conclusion by describing an imaginary conversation between Wesley and himself. The verdict, which every Methodist theologian must either accept or give reasons for rejecting, is that the Consecration of Coke rested on a valid foundation—not on King or on Stillingfleet, but on a Divine commission. Instead of asking whether Wesley was right or wrong according to the rubric of the Anglican Church, we should ask whether or not he was obeying the law of God. Then we are in no doubt. God had given him a title better established than any that man could bestow. Brother Charles, deeply wounded, might write in his distress:

*Gainst Thy truth he stops his ear,
Will not see his children's prayer:*

*Shuts his eyes against the light,
Sure that he alone is right.*

and beseech his Lord:

*Help us for our guide to pray,
Lost in his mistaken way.*

But the verdict of this valuable book is that John's eyes were wider open than Charles's, and that in answering the call, neglected by the Anglican Bishops, to ordain men that they might care for souls in America, he had not lost his providential way.

ALLEN BIRTWHISTLE

Moravian and Methodist, by Clifford W. Towlson, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. (Epworth Press, 25s.)

The author of this book believes that the relations between the Methodists and the Moravians during the lifetime of John Wesley and the influence which each exerted on the other have never been sufficiently explored and recognized, and he proceeds to remedy this in a manner which holds and fascinates the reader from the first page to the last. The 'conversion' of the Wesleys, especially that of John, is one of the crucial points of Dr Towlson's discussion, and he traces the various influences which led to it. Important among them was Wesley's contacts with the Moravian Brethren both during and after his life in Georgia. The Church order and religious beliefs of the Moravians are closely studied and an account is given of Wesley's critical attitude and of the complete separation which took place when the English Brethren lapsed into Quietism. The story is one of fluctuating sympathy and understanding on both sides, and the author records the events in detail, culminating in the last and lukewarm attempt at union in 1785, which proved abortive. There are gaps and discrepancies in the records, for some of which the writer offers plausible reasons. An outstanding feature of the latter part of the narrative section is the hesitant and sometimes hostile attitude of John Wesley, but in spite of all his doubts and disapprovals, he maintained a warm admiration for the Brethren in general. In the last two chapters of the book, Dr Towlson estimates the debt which each communion owed to the other in respect both of belief and practice, and it seems that Methodism was the greater gainer of the two. Theologically they shared a fundamental conviction of the importance of the doctrines of Justification by Faith and Christian Assurance, but differed somewhat in their interpretation, particularly of the former. Wesley always stressed the necessity for 'works' as the proof and outcome of Faith; among the Moravians such stress as there was disappeared entirely during the short, unhappy period of Quietism in England, but it gained strength later. The Moravians undoubtedly helped to strengthen in Methodism the sense of fellowship. To their example, Wesley owed, in part, his institution of bands, the love-feast, and the watchnight service. Some of the Brethren had preached in the open air, but there was not general approval of the practice. Extempore praying and preaching and the employment of lay preachers are examined; so is the similarity between the Methodist Conference and the Moravian Synod, and also the views of the two communions on education, both of which were convinced of its extreme importance. The success of the Wesleys seems to have broadened the Moravian ideas on evangelism, and to have created a greater zeal for good works beyond their own boundaries. There is a discussion on the practice of the Lot, which, when reason failed, was regularly resorted to by the Moravians, and suggestions are given why, for a short time, it was used by the logically-minded John Wesley. One of the most pleasing sections of the book is that on hymnology. There is a detailed and illuminating account of the various hymnbooks which directly or indirectly contributed to the worship of both parties, and the reader is helped to realize why admiration for and use of Charles Wesley's hymns and the translations of John Wesley from German

sources extend beyond the bounds of both the Moravian, and the Methodist Church. There is much valuable material in these pages of which lack of space forbids any mention. One cannot commend this work too highly. It is eminently scholarly, though easily within the grasp of the general reader, and it gives evidence of wide research and much thought. In addition to Methodist sources, Dr Towlson has consulted a number of Moravian books and documents. The plan of the book is admirable and the style is all that the most exacting purist could wish. It is clear, concise and beautifully phrased, demanding no effort of attention on the reader's part, but carrying him from page to page with a keen anticipation of what is to come. A valuable feature of the book are the summaries appended to each chapter, which help to fix the main points in the mind of the reader. Mention must also be made of the writer's entire impartiality throughout. Though himself a Methodist, he is, rightly, no special pleader for the varied reactions of John Wesley. He states the facts on both sides, pleasant and unpleasant, and leaves them to speak for themselves. Not always is it a reviewer's good fortune to write on such a book as this. The reading of it has been a sheer and profitable delight. No student of religion in this country and of Methodism in particular can afford to miss it. It will surely become a 'classic', and we welcome it to a place among the most distinguished volumes that have issued from John Wesley's Bookroom, now the Epworth Press.

W. L. DOUGHTY

Faith and Logic, Oxford Essays in Philosophical Theology, ed. Basil Mitchell. (Allen & Unwin, 21s.)

A group of Anglican theologians and philosophers, aware that (to quote Professor Ryle) 'in our half-century philosophy and theology have not been on speaking terms', have been meeting since the war, and have now produced this volume of essays. Whilst containing some repetition and some diversities of opinion, it bears the stamp of group-discussion, and it merits careful consideration by theologians and philosophers alike. It leaves us in no doubt that the debate is still on, but it makes a worthy contribution. The debate concerns the significance of theological language. Most of the contemporary philosophers who may be roughly termed 'linguistic analysts' no longer rule out the possibility of meaningful theological statements, but they ask, with unfaltering, even if somewhat varied, pressure, questions about their meaning, and, in particular, about their verification. The attack has been fierce, and if the attackers have sometimes shifted their ground, they have also revealed the weakness in many defences. The writers of these essays are by no means wholly on the defensive; they seek to talk *with* rather than to talk *against*, and (in varying degrees) they accept many of the premises and some of the conclusions of the present-day opponents of traditional metaphysics. The longest essay, and the one that will probably be of greatest interest to the non-philosopher, is by Mr I. M. Crombie, upon 'The Possibility of Theological Statements'. He suggests that terms such as 'creation', 'redemption', 'judgement' are 'faithful parables' which illuminate facts in our experience because they are revelatory of facts which fall outside our experience. Of two contributions by Austin Farrer the more interesting is a study of Revelation, which attempts to re-state belief in incarnation and in inspiration. Other writers contribute useful essays about the soul and about the term 'grace'. G. C. Stead offers an account of 'how theologians reason', and I suspect that it may be upon this article that criticism will most readily fasten. R. M. Hare's discussion of the relation between religion and morals echoes previous work of his own, shows a somewhat different view-point from that of some of his fellow authors and is rather brief for its purpose. The most stimulating essay, which is also rather more technical, is M. B. Foster's attempt to find out what philosophers (and others) mean when they say: '*We* believe this . . . *we* mean that'. Brief criticism would be unfair and misleading. It is to be hoped that readers who have been trained in older

types of philosophy will not stand aside from this debate. No less important is this book for those whose concern is with general evangelism rather than with academic discussion. There are not a few indications that some questions which this book seeks to answer are being asked by the common man. Indeed, perhaps he always has asked them. Those who teach must first listen, and it may well be that those who question what we say may help us more fully to understand what we say. **FREDERIC GREEVES**

Nurslings of Immortality, by Raynor C. Johnson. (Hodder & Stoughton, 25s.)

The Master of Queen's College, Melbourne, is a qualified scientist with wide interests in philosophy, theology and, especially, paranormal psychology and psychic research. In this volume he covers a wide canvas of human enquiry and speculation, and offers a comprehensive 'philosophy of life'. This philosophy he shares with a Mr Douglas Fawcett, whose two books are unknown to this reviewer and (probably) to most readers. The philosophy of *Imaginism* has points of similarity with the teaching of Steiner and of A. N. Whitehead, with Hinduism, and (although this is, surprisingly, never mentioned) with the metaphysics of Berkeley, Leibniz, and, especially, James Ward. The reader must, however, learn the vocabulary of Fawcett and Johnson if he is to find his way through this book. It is impossible to offer a summary here, but, in spite of Dr Weatherhead's isolation (in a strongly commendatory Foreword) of the 'religious' from the philosophical parts of the book, 'Imaginism' is one of the two controlling concepts. Creation is interpreted as Divine Imagining; all existents ('conscita') are maintained by 'consciring'. A type of psychic or spiritual pluralism is presented to us, and in this lies both the likeness to and the divergence from James Ward. In addition to the Divine Imagining ('the supreme frontal power') there is a finite God related to the World System of which we are part. By this notion the author boldly claims to have solved the problem of evil, although he also offers other suggestions familiar to students of attempted theodicies. The second dominating concept is that of the allegedly assured findings of psychic research and other allied studies. An interesting, but quite uncritical, summary of such work is given, and, in the closing chapters, reincarnation and the 'next life' are described in terms of the 'communications' made after death by F. W. H. Myers and by an unnamed, deceased personal friend of the writer. These are found to be in harmony with Fawcett's teaching. This book may be ignored by many because of the confident assurance with which the author presents his case, and because, at so many points, little understanding is shown of the meaning of more orthodox Christian doctrine. Yet many issues of great significance are raised, many illuminating comments are offered, and attention is drawn to a vast field of study which is all too often bye-passed by natural scientists and philosophers alike. There is no index other than a list of authors cited, and there is but the slightest reference to the Bible.

FREDERIC GREEVES

Thinking Towards Religion: A Philosophical Approach to Religious Faith, by Paul Roubiczek. (Darwen Finlayson, 15s.)

This book is not a textbook on the philosophy of religion, nor a work on what used to be called Christian evidences, but a book which, like Temple's *Mens Creatrix* or Streeter's *Reality*, surveys the great fields of human endeavour and shows that, properly understood, they point in the direction of religion. It speaks indeed with frequent disapproval of all-inclusive unitary systems which seek to explain the whole of existence by a single fundamental concept, and bases itself on a clear distinction between external and internal reality. The distinction is carefully made, and is used at once to illuminate a number of problems, such as that of determinism and freedom, a problem that recurs in a more theological context at the end of the book. Despite the popular belief that science can solve all our problems, there are limits to our knowledge

even of external reality. We then turn to those more personal activities which are outside the scope of science. Feeling, rightly understood in a broad sense, is here an organ of knowledge. Due weight must be given both to the objective and to the subjective elements in value-judgements. The traditional triad of values is itself evaluated; and the book reached its climax in a discussion of faith. Faith is said to be beyond the scope of philosophy, but the philosopher can indicate the right approach to it. When he has dismissed metaphysical systems he must avoid the two blind alleys of purely logical analysis and pure irrationalism, and show that the correct way of thinking points towards faith. Thus philosophy becomes 'thinking towards religion'. This bald summary, however, gives a very imperfect impression of the merits of the book. Mr Roubiczek, who was born in Prague and has shared in the sufferings of Europe in our century, has obviously read widely both in philosophy and in those other branches of learning which are in some sense themselves the subject-matter of philosophy. He writes in a lucid, non-technical style, so that the book can be understood by those not versed in philosophy. In some places, however, especially towards the end, the thought is so closely packed that a less compressed style, with more illustrations, would be helpful. He shows a finely sensitive insight, particularly in some of his sympathetic *obiter dicta* about Christianity, though we do not accept his view that those who do not understand the significance of Jesus often doubt His existence. It is refreshing to find a philosopher who is willing to consider other subjects than the fashionable linguistic analysis, important as that may be at its own level. His dislike of metaphysical systems and his bifurcation of reality might suggest that his mind takes refuge in an untenable dualism instead of pressing on to a comprehensive view of reality; but his division is not intended to be absolute, and is, in his hands, a great aid to understanding. He is not led astray, as some have been, into the naïve exploitation of such discoveries of physics as the uncertainty principle. Christianity is not of course to be identified with belief in such doctrines as the objective reference of value-judgements, as the author is well aware, but such studies as these clear the ground for faith and deserve high praise.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

New Testament Faith for Today, by A. N. Wilder. (S.C.M. Press, 15s.)

The recovery of Biblical Theology is now widely accepted as the most fruitful result of theological scholarship in recent years, so much so that discontented murmurs against it are already being heard. It is therefore timely that this book should be published in Britain, for it is fundamentally concerned with what we make of Biblical Theology now we have recovered it. Professor Wilder brings to bear on this investigation, not only much learning, but also a sensitive and imaginative grasp of the New Testament message, both in its range and depth. He knows well that we live in an age whose thinking is moulded by scientific presuppositions, but that (as he says) 'in the New Testament we find ourselves face to face with a depth of mood, a sense of existence, which transcends our usual categories'. And yet the New Testament assertions, at least in the form in which they were originally made, are no longer readily available for us today. The evangelist, even more than the scholar, needs to know what is to be done with them. The author gives a sympathetic hearing to Dr Bultmann's programme of so-called 'demythologizing', but brings a double criticism to bear upon it. On the one hand, it underestimates the essential place of mythology (imaginative presentation) in the communication of the faith; and, on the other, by representing the New Testament proclamation exclusively as a parable of grace and judgement *here and now* for any man or generation that hears it, seriously impairs its scope and content. In setting out his own interpretation, Professor Wilder takes in turn the proclamation of Jesus, the message of Paul, and the Johannine witness. For each he outlines the central message, discusses why it was so powerful, and finally rephrases it in a way that

may convey its substance and force to modern men. The scheme is bold and merits our admiration; though it does not make for easy reading, and it may be that many readers would benefit by taking the concluding chapter first. It is possible, too, that the book will be more valuable for the stimulus it gives to thought than for its suggested remodelling of New Testament language. It is not at once obvious that the most appropriate way of modernizing the words of Jesus is to say that 'he was announcing a sublime Tomorrow for mankind'. Nor will all Professor Wilder's exegetical judgments command immediate assent—e.g. his statement that 'Jesus did not announce the church as we understand it or even foresee it'. Nevertheless, this is a book to be read with attention, discrimination, and gratitude.

KENNETH GRAYSTON

Dictionnaire d'archéologie biblique, by W. Corswant. (Delachaux & Niestlé, Sw. Frs. 20.30.)

'*Tout compte, dans la Révélation*', writes André Parrot in his Preface to this book. Professor Corswant, late Professor of History and Biblical Archaeology at Neuchâtel, makes his immense knowledge of Hebrew and early Christian environment easily accessible for those who give religious instruction and who wish to make their teaching vivid. He died before his work was completed. One of his pupils, M. Edouard Urech, edited, supplemented, and illustrated Professor Corswant's articles. This dictionary, like a cookery book, can prove itself only by being used. It justifies its claim to aid vividness. The articles are brightly written and the illustrations, from many sources, are enchanting. A teacher once surprisingly advised his pupils to improve their Italian by reading, not literature, but a good dictionary. This dictionary's quality seems at first to make Bible study unnecessary. In fact, however, our attention is deftly pointed to Scripture by the neat list of references after each article. From an attractive illustration we learn that Hebrew women were human enough to wear ear-rings, and then we discover the choice proverb, 'As a ring of gold in a swine's snout, so is a fair woman which is without discretion' (it sounds better in French). Articles under 'Croix', 'Crucifiement', and 'Tombeau' show that the Christian revelation of God is firmly 'earthed' in historical custom. In days when some thinkers who are concerned to bring Christ to industrial society disparage the quest for the Jesus of history, the sketch of a plough like those He made when He was a tool-maker still repeats His call to whole-heartedness. Everything counts in Revelation. This dictionary is French in language, and sometimes in choice of topic. One mention of garlic in Scripture (Num. 11_g) evokes seventy words and the mental picture of the Children of Israel in the desert haunted by its memory. The work also seeks to be a manual. It is valuable to have the contents tabulated, but unfortunately twentieth-century French, and unbiblical, categories are employed. '*La vie profane*' (family life, work, political institutions) is separated from '*la vie religieuse*' (sacred places, persons, times, and acts); fauna, flora, and minerals are separated from both. If biblical archaeology is, as Professor Ernest Wright says, 'a special "armchair" variety of general archaeology', this book will find its place. It is claimed to be unique in French. Manuals of archaeology are often too technical, and dictionaries too heavy for the armchair. In its well-produced, attractive format, and coming from the publishers of André Parrot's *Cahiers d'archéologie biblique*, it deserves a great welcome, and, indeed, an English translator.

C. HUGHES SMITH

Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis, by William Graham Cole. (Allen & Unwin, 21s.)

This important study contributes to a new Christian orientation in matters of sex and marriage and it is written in a lively and interesting fashion. It is what the author terms an 'ideological study'. It is not intended to be of immediate practical value to the psychotherapist or pastor, but recounts the history of Christian theorizing on these

matters and covers the New Testament, the Medieval Church, the Reformers, and the work of modern Catholics and Protestants who have felt the impact of Freud and his successors, whose work the author describes. The author's thesis is that there are two possible attitudes to sex, which he calls 'naturalism' and 'dualism' respectively. 'Naturalism', which is for him Jewish in origin, sees man as a psychosomatic whole and thus implies a frank acceptance of sex. 'Dualism' is a product of Hellenistic thought, which separated body and soul, with a deep depreciation of the former, and thus of the sexual instinct. For the author there is a kind of Fall in the history of the Christian attitude to sex. This took place when the Church abandoned the naturalistic Hebrew attitude and fell into Hellenistic depreciation of bodily life. He finds no trace of a dualistic attitude in Jesus's teaching and holds that the spirit of His ethic makes possible a sound and realistic approach to sexual problems. It was Paul who all unwittingly was the cause of the Fall. Although Paul as a Jew was imbued with Hebrew naturalism, as a dweller in Tarsus he moved in the Hellenistic world, whose wise men regarded the body as a tomb. Also his apocalyptic outlook carried with it a depreciation of marriage because the times were bad and shortly to be ended. Thus, in spite of the fine things that he could say about marriage, he could also say, 'It is good for a man not to touch a woman'. A later generation, to which the Jewish atmosphere was foreign, quickly lent a more radical meaning to the words of Paul, and came to regard sex as an evil to be avoided, and virginity as the true path to eternal life. This attitude was clamped down upon the medieval Church by the great thinkers St Augustine and St Thomas Aquinas, whose essential idea of the good life was of the life according to reason. They both had the contemplative's distrust of anything that disturbed emotional life. Augustine declared marriage to be inferior to celibacy as a lame man is inferior to a sound man, although a lame man may limp to a good destination. The Christian's concern was with the second birth. He should leave the physical birth and procreation to the heathen. St Thomas Aquinas follows him essentially in this attitude, although he is more temperate in his attitude to pleasure and has more understanding of the good of marriage. The attitude of these thinkers is essentially that of the Roman Church today, and the author has no difficulty in showing, in his treatment of modern Catholic theorists on sex, that for all their desire to justify marriage as a sacrament, they are hampered by a theology which still regards it as dangerous and inferior. The Reformers, by their return to the Bible, did to some extent break the power of this dualism, but it still lives on in the suspicion of woman and of sex which flashes out at times in both Luther and Calvin. The author sees the discoveries of Freud as opening the way to a modern naturalism, a realization of sex as the most potent factor in human life, and one which requires honest and reverent acceptance. He mentions modifications of the theory of Freud by the later analysts. He reviews the contributions of modern protestant thinkers, including Leslie Weatherhead, and finally contributes a valuable constructive section. The author is aware of the tensions between psychoanalysis and Christianity but he has honestly worked through them. The book is a brave book and points a way to a kinder and more understanding Christian ethic of sex; and while perhaps the theological critic can raise an eyebrow on his envisaging speculative circumstances in which polygamy would be permissible, the real weight of the author's understanding and contribution is a powerful support to the modern Christian conception of marriage. This is a rewarding book, and should be read by those who feel the urgency of the questions it raises. ERASTUS EVANS

The Status of Animals in the Christian Religion, by C. W. Hume, M.C., B.Sc., with marginal drawings by Fougasse. (Universities Federation for Animal Welfare, 8s. 6d.)

This is a well-documented treatise on the Christian status of animals, and begins with

a chapter on the impatience of an Anglican layman, who regrets the tardy recognition by the Church at large, of the virtue of kindness and the vice of cruelty to the dumb creation. The author recalls the animals of the Bible, and shows that the Old Testament by inference and the New Testament by advocacy treat them with respect. He contrasts this scriptural attitude with that of the philosophers and philosophies of the majority of the leaders of the early Christian Church. In the early days of Christianity, animals came to lose their status, but in time wiser attitudes prevailed and the creature world began to regain its rightful place. Many of the saints were portrayed as animal-lovers, till the time of the Renaissance, which brought again a revival of pagan superstition and cruelty. This was corrected by the Evangelical Revival, which brought with it the rebirth of civilization. Men moved on from the time when it was believed that animals had no souls. One of the creatures which the author commends is the rat, which he claims has peculiar advantages of smallness, cleanliness, ease of accommodation and inexpensive maintenance, and of whom the general objection on the part of mankind is an acquired phobia. The sensations, instinct, learning and reasoning of these creatures are advocated, and evidence of personality is drawn from contact with human beings. The formulation of a policy on the part of the Christian churches is given in the official pronouncements on the subject. Another chapter speaks of the scale of priorities given to the theme, and advocacy is made of charity and humility towards the creation, and a condemnation of callousness, contempt and greed. To preach the gospel to every creature is the will of God. A group of seven additional notes is provided. These vary from the meaning of the word 'rationalism' to the provision of prayers for animals. A good index is provided, and the drawings, with a suitable Scripture reference in every case, by the artist Fougasse are both varied and good.

J. H. MARTIN

From My New Shelf

BY R. NEWTON FLEW

Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and edited by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich from the German fourth edition (1949-52) of the *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* of Walter Bauer (C.U.P., 1951.) Thirty years ago Professor Wilbert F. Howard introduced the German second edition of this book to readers of this *QUARTERLY* in language almost lyrical. For the first time, due deference was paid to the epoch-making discoveries of papyri, and to the grammars which were describing the Greek language used in the first century A.D. My own copy is of the edition of 1928; and I treasure memories of a visit in 1929 to the study of Walter Bauer in Göttingen. His industry can only be described in terms of Browning's 'Grammarians', though it is to be hoped that he is escaping the various diseases with which Browning endows his hero. One sentence from a leading Church historian must suffice. Baron H. von Campenhausen speaks of it as a work 'which considered as the performance of one man strikes one as almost fabulous'. Happily, Walter Bauer is still writing. The translators were set aside for a task which must have taken more than five years. They have given new treatment to a number of words, and have included a few words not in Bauer and some words from the apparatus of the recently-issued Nestlé text. The characteristic of Bauer's work which some of us value most is the list of special articles on difficult words: e.g. on *τέλειος*, there are at least eight references given to notable articles on the word and its meaning in the New Testament, including its use in the Mystery Religions. These references extend

to late 1954. The whole volume is magnificently produced by the Cambridge University Press and is partly financed by the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church in America. May it be as successful as it deserves.

The Gospel according to St Mark, by C. Leslie Mitton (Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.). This fresh volume, the third to be published in the Epworth Preacher's Commentaries, maintains the high standard set by Dr Vincent Taylor, in his recent exposition of Romans. I guess that the writers of books in this series would more swiftly write a hundred thousand words on St Mark than the fifty thousand allowed. This book is a miracle of simplicity. The writer has found Mark's Gospel 'perhaps the most exciting of the four Gospels.' The late Professor Burkitt of Cambridge often used the phrase, 'the astonishing originality of St Mark'. It was the first-time that a tiny tract had been written containing the good news of One who revealed God in what He said and did and was throughout a real human life, and especially in what He suffered. Dr Mitton writes for young local preachers. He suggests texts and subjects for sermons. He handles the scriptures with reverence. He never cloaks difficulties, such as nature-miracles. But he never leaves us without a sense that we are discovering rich treasures when we are reading these exciting pages of St Mark.

All His Grace, by Donald Soper (Epworth Press, 4s. 6d.). In this Methodist 'Lent Book' Dr Soper has been faithful to his title. I can give the book no higher praise. Those who love the *Methodist Hymn-book* will immediately turn to Hymn 87, 'Jesus comes with all His grace, Comes to save a fallen race'. They will want to say, 'What an inspired title for a book!' The book has been written, says Dr Soper, because, 'I want to know more, and I want others to know more of the sublime virtues of Jesus Christ. . . . It is the goodness of my Lord which challenges my sinfulness.' The first eight chapters deal with Single-mindedness, Courage, Honesty, Meekness, Hopefulness, Moral Excellence, Faith and Love—each one of these eight a 'sublime virtue' of Jesus. The author then works to a splendid climax in *Grace Abounding* and *Grace Available*, and the Four Acts of Offering in the traditional Liturgies.

Living the Ten Commandments, by Carrol E. Simcox (Dacre Press, 6s.). This 'Lent Book' is a sequel of *Living the Creed*, and *Living the Lord's Prayer*. The author of this trilogy is a well-known parish priest in New York. He expounds the Ten Commandments by constant use of the Sermon on the Mount, and makes every page sparkle. Every one of his eleven chapters is prefaced by quotations, none of them hackneyed, from authors such as Father D'Arcy and Aeschylus, Pascal and William Temple, St Francis de Sales and Sir Walter Scott. That seems a sumptuous feast for the Lenten fast, but it is also challenging and disturbing, as the author wanted it to be.

Holy is His Name: Studies in the Problem of Evil, by Norman Hook (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). This little book represents a series of lectures delivered by the Dean of Norwich in Lent, 1955. They were intended to serve the cause of Adult Religious education in the diocese, but they certainly deserve a wider public. The first sentence is: 'There is nothing more tragic in human experience than loneliness, and the loneliness of the human soul which cannot believe in the Good God and enjoy the consolations of religion is the most tragic of all forms of loneliness.' The last line of the book is the text quoted by St Paul: 'the good things which God hath prepared for them that love Him.' Between these two morsels of the book is a well-reasoned argument addressed to men who find it hard to believe in the goodness of God.

Les Deux Epîtres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniens, by Charles Masson (Delachaux & Niestlé, Neuchâtel, Sw. Frs. 8.85). This commentary from a Professor in the

University of Lausanne is the seventh epistle to appear in the series which is being produced by Swiss New Testament scholars. It is a model of what a modern commentary should be: frank, honest, and as lucid and learned as we always expect Swiss commentators to be—witness Excursus I on the 'Saying of the Lord Jesus' (1 Thess. 4¹⁵⁻¹⁷) and Excursus II on the 'Significance of 1 Thess. 4¹³⁻¹⁸ for the Church Today.' Professor Masson cannot bring himself to believe that the Second Epistle is from St Paul, and bases his case on the first twelve verses of the second chapter.

According to St Paul; A Study-course on the New Testament Letters, by H. F. Mathews (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). This book has been written with the fifth- and sixth-formers in view, and to help those who teach them. But it will be an immense help to adult Church members who want to understand St Paul and to estimate 'the magnitude of our debt to him'. The author pays a tribute to Dr J. A. Findlay above all his teachers, a tribute in which a great number would like to join: 'He it was', says Dr Mathews, who 'made the New Testament for us the most treasured possession in all the world.' It is the sense of indebtedness that makes his 'study course' so lively and so interesting. He begins with the two ways in which Christians could be recognized as they moved to a strange town: the phrase, *Maranatha*, and the secret sign, the fish. He has an eye for an apt parallel. In explaining the difference between a modern 'letter' and the epistle-form of ancient literature, he cites the 'Open Letter to the reverend Dr Hyde of Honolulu' in which Robert Louis Stevenson defended Father Damien from scurrilous attacks on his character. The attention has been secured, and held, till in due season the class is ready for his masterly handling of justification by faith, and the Epistle to the Romans. He doesn't shirk difficulties, but encourages his readers to discuss them. There are more than a dozen questionnaires to unloose the stammering tongues. The chief test (I believe) in this way of teaching is the quality of the questions, whether asked in discussion or in examinations. By this standard Dr Mathews is easily first-class. So is the whole of this little book.

Calvin's Sermons on Isaiah's Prophecy of the Death and Passion of Christ, translated and edited by T. H. L. Parker (James Clarke, 12s. 6d.). These seven sermons on Isaiah 53 have been selected because they were preached by Calvin as a series in 1558. This was a few months before the final revision of the *Institutes*. They represent his maturity, and Mr Parker has taken a scholar's pains to establish a reliable text. There are sixteen pages of very careful introduction, and each sermon is preceded by an abridgement of Calvin's comments from the relevant passage of the 1559 commentary. But, of course, the sermons are the thing. They are tender and compassionate, not without the scathing sentence in many a paragraph which searches the depths of the heart. On the sentence, 'He bare the iniquity of many', Calvin says: "This word 'many' is often as good as equivalent to 'all'". And indeed our Lord Jesus was offered to all the world. . . . And let us realize that if we come flocking to our Lord Jesus Christ, we shall not hinder one another and prevent Him being sufficient for each of us.' This is, indeed, a book for all who are interested in Calvin studies.

The Prayers of Susanna Wesley, edited and arranged by W. L. Doughty (Epworth Press, 5s.). The editor has done his work with his usual fine taste and originality. Both are evident in his plan of choosing forty prayers, and prefixing to each of them one or two verses of hymns. All of these (save one) are from the 1782 and 1793 *Methodist Hymn-books*. Thus the work of John Wesley and the work of Charles are bound up together, as it were, in their mother's prayers. It is what she would have loved.

The Reformed Pastor, by Richard Baxter, edited by Hugh Martin (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.). This book is the masterpiece of the man who, as Dr Martin says in a brief Preface, represents Puritanism at its best. It could not be left out of the S.C.M. 'Treasury of Christian Books'. The selection of passages is made by one who like Principal J. T. Wilkinson (whose work on Baxter Mr Martin praises) has made the seventeenth century a special study. The book is attractively produced.

The Westminster Pulpit: The Preaching of G. Campbell Morgan (Pickering & Inglis, 18s. 6d.). This is Volume VIII of a series of ten volumes. The sermons come from one who was a genius in the pulpit. His preaching was biblical preaching. He was of those preachers of whom you could say that if you only heard him once he was unforgettable. Many illustrations are in these sermons which the reader will not forget.

The Twelve Together, by T. Ralph Morton (The Iona Community, 7s. 6d.). This book will be useful because it actually dares to go back beyond Pentecost, right back to the life lived with His disciples by our Lord. Mr Morton goes farther in audacity. He dares to say that it is almost impossible to overestimate the debt which the Church owes to the movement of thought which we now dismiss as liberal. The present reviewer entirely agrees. It does seem as though nobody now cares to inquire what Jesus was doing with His disciples. We shall fail if we do not see them as a body and not merely as individuals. This is a book written simply, on one of the most profound subjects that the author could choose.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Congregational Quarterly, April 1957.

The Cinderella of Theology: The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, by G. J. Sirks.

Thoughts on Acts, by John Ferguson.

The Dilemma of the Dutch Reformed Churches in South Africa, by Leonard Heap.

Baptists in Communist Russia, by J. D. Hughey, Jr.

Interpretation, October 1956.

Serious Encounter, by H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Imagination in Excelsis, by Neil Gregor-Smith.

January 1957. The Law and the Gospel. The Meaning of the Ten Commandments in Israel and for Us, by Walther Eichrodt. Translated by Charles F. McRae.

Theology Today, October 1956. Almost the whole of this issue is devoted to articles on the Theology of Karl Barth.

Theology Today, January 1957.

The New Testament Idea of the Church, by Edward Schweizer.

Christ, the Church, and Reunion, by W. Norman Pittenger.

Pres,
brief
C.M.
to like
e the

ng &
come
. He
e was
orget.

This
back
acity.
nurch
esent
what
y and
ound

srail

n the